AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—VOL. V.—(XV.)—AUGUST, 1896.—NO. 2.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE LEO XIII, ON THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

To Our Venerable Brethren

The Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops and other Ordinaries in Peace and Communion with the Apostolic See.

LEO XIII.

Venerable Brethren, Health and Benediction.

I.

IT is sufficiently well known unto you that no small share of our thoughts and of our care is devoted to the endeavor of bringing back to the *fold*, placed under the guardianship of Jesus Christ, Chief Pastor of souls, sheep that have strayed. Bent upon this, we have thought it most conducive to this salutary end and purpose to outline the model and, as it were, the lineaments of the Church. Amongst these the most worthy of our chief consideration is *Unity*. This the Divine Author impressed on it as a lasting sign of truth and unconquerable strength. The essential beauty and comeliness of the Church ought greatly to influence the minds of those who consider it. Nor is it improbable that ignorance may be dispelled by the consideration; that false ideas and prejudices may be dissipated from the minds chiefly of those who find themselves in error without fault of theirs, and that even a love for the Church may be stirred

up in the souls of men, like unto that charity wherewith Christ loved and united Himself to that Spouse redeemed by His precious blood. "Christ loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it." (Eph. v, 25).

If those prepared to return to their most loving Mother (not yet fully known, or culpably abandoned) should perceive that this return involves, not, indeed, the shedding of their blood (at which price nevertheless the Church was bought by Jesus Christ), but some lesser trouble and labor, let them clearly understand that this burden has been laid on them not by the will of man but by the will and command of God. They may thus, by the help of heavenly grace, realize and feel the truth of the divine saying, "My yoke is sweet and my burden light." (Matt. xi, 30).

Wherefore, having put all our hope in the "Father of lights," from whom "cometh every best gift and every perfect gift," (Ep. James i, 17)—from Him, namely, who alone "gives the increase," (1 Cor. iii, 6)—we earnestly pray that He will grant us the power of bringing conviction home to the minds of men.

II.

Although God can do by His own power all that is effected by created natures, nevertheless in the counsels of His loving Providence He has preferred to help men by the instrumentality of men. And, as in the natural order He does not usually give full perfection except by means of man's work and action, so also He makes use of human aid for that which lies beyond the limits of nature, that is to say, for the sanctification and salvation of souls. But it is obvious that nothing can be communicated to others by men through the aid of external things which the senses can perceive. For this reason the Son of God assumed human nature—"who being in the form of God . . . . emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of a man," (Philipp. ii, 6-7)—and thus living on earth He taught His doctrine and gave His laws, conversing with men.

III.

And, since it was necessary that His divine mission should be perpetuated to the end of time, He took to Himself Disciples, trained by Himself, and made them partakers of His own authority. And, when He had invoked upon them from Heaven the *Spirit of Truth*, He bade them go through the whole world and faithfully preach to all nations what He had taught and what He had commanded, so that by the profession of His doctrine, and the observance of His laws, the human race might attain to holiness on earth and never-ending happiness in Heaven. In this wise, and on this principle, the Church was begotten. If we consider the chief end of this Church, and the approximate efficient causes of salvation, it is undoubtedly *spiritual;* but in regard to those who constitute it, and to the things which lead to these spiritual gifts, it is *external* and necessarily visible. The Apostles received a mission to teach by visible and audible signs, and they discharged their mission only by words and acts which certainly appealed to the senses. So that their voices falling upon the ears of those who heard them begot faith in souls—"Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ." (Rom. x, 17). And faith itself—that is assent given to the first and supreme truth—though residing essentially in the intellect, must be manifested by outward profession—"For with the heart we believe unto justice, but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. x, 10). In the same way in man, nothing is more internal than heavenly grace which begets sanctity, but the ordinary and chief means of obtaining grace are external; that is to say, the sacraments which are administered by men specially chosen for that purpose, through certain ordination.

Jesus Christ commanded His Apostles and their successors to the end of time to teach and rule the nations. He ordered the nations to accept their teaching and obey their authority. But this correlation of rights and duties in the Christian commonwealth not only could not have been made permanent, but could not even have been initiated except through

the senses, which are of all things the messengers and interpreters.

For this reason the Church is so often called in Holy Writ a *body*, and even *the body of Christ*—"Now you are the body of Christ,"—(1 Cor. xii, 27)—and precisely because it is a body is the Church visible; and because it is the body of Christ is it living and energizing, because the infusion of His power Christ guards and sustains it, just as the vine gives nourishment and renders fruitful the branches united to it. And as in animals the vital principle is unseen and invisible, and is evidenced and manifested by the movements and action of the members, so the principle of supernatural life in the Church is clearly shown in its activity.

From this it follows that those who arbitrarily conjure up and picture to themselves a hidden and invisible Church are in grievous and pernicious error; as also are those who regard the Church as a human institution which claims a certain obedience in discipline and external duties, but which is without the perennial communication of the gifts of divine grace, and without all that which testifies by constant and undoubted signs to the existence of a vital principle drawn from God. It is assuredly as impossible that the Church of Jesus Christ can be the one or the other, as that man should be a body alone or a soul alone. The connection and union of both elements is as absolutely necessary to the true Church as the intimate union of the soul and body is to human nature. The Church is not something dead; it is the body of Christ endowed with supernatural life. As Christ, the Head and Exemplar, is not wholly in His visible human nature, which Photinians and Nestorians assert, nor wholly in the invisible divine nature, as the Monophysites hold, but as one, from and in both natures, visible and invisible; so the mystical body of Christ is the true Church, only because its visible parts draw life and power from the supernatural gifts and sources whence spring their very nature and essence. But since the Church is *such* by divine will and constitution, *such* it must uniformly

remain to the end of time. If it did not, then it would not have been founded as perpetual, and the end set before it would have been limited to some certain place and to some certain period of time; both of which are contrary to the truth. The union consequently of visible and invisible elements because it harmonizes with the natural order, and by God's will belongs to the very essence of the Church, must necessarily remain so long as the Church itself shall endure. Wherefore Chrysostom writes: "Secede not from the Church: for nothing is stronger than the Church. Thy hope is the Church; thy salvation is the Church; thy refuge is the Church. It is higher than the heavens and wider than the earth. It never grows old, but is ever full of vigor. Wherefore Holy Writ pointing to its strength and stability calls it a mountain." (Hom. *De capto Eutropio*, n. 6).

Augustine, too, says: "Unbelievers think that the Christian religion will last for a certain period in the world and will then disappear. But it will remain as long as the sun—as long as the sun rises and sets; that is, as long as the ages of time shall roll, the Church of God—the true body of Christ on earth—will not disappear." (In Psalm. lxx, n. 8). And in another place: "The Church will totter if its foundation shakes; but how can Christ be moved? . . . Christ remaining immovable, it (the Church) shall never be shaken. Where are they that say that the Church has disappeared from the world, when it cannot even be shaken?" (*Enarratio* in Psalm. ciii, sermo ii, n. 5).

He who seeks the truth must be guided by these fundamental principles. That is to say, that Christ the Lord instituted and formed the Church; wherefore when we are asked what its nature is, the main thing is to see what Christ wished and what in fact He did. Judged by such a criterion it is the unity of the Church which must be principally considered; and of this, for the general good, we have deemed it useful to speak in this Encyclical.

IV.

It was so evident from the clear and frequent testimonies of Holy Writ that the true Church of Jesus Chris is *one* that no Christian can dare to deny it. But in judging and determining the nature of this unity many have erred in various ways. Not the foundation of the Church alone, but its whole constitution, belongs to the class of things effected by Christ's free choice. For this reason the entire case must be judged by what was actually done. We must consequently investigate not how the Church may possibly be one, but how He, who founded it, willed that it should be one.

But when we consider what was actually done we find that Jesus Christ did not, in point of fact, institute a Church to embrace several communities similar in nature, but in themselves distinct, and lacking those bonds which render the Church one and indivisible after that manner in which in the symbol of our faith we profess: "I believe in one Church."

"The Church in respect of its unity belongs to the category of things indivisible by nature, though heretics try to divide it into many parts. . . . . We say, therefore, that the Catholic Church is one in its essence, in its doctrine, in its origin, and in its excellence. . . . . Furthermore, the eminence of the Church arises from its unity, as the principle of its constitution—a unity surpassing all else, and having nothing like unto it or equal to it." (S. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromatum* lib. viii, c. 17). For this reason Christ, speaking of this mystical edifice, mentions only one Church, which he calls *His own*—"I will build my Church;" any other Church except this one, since it has not been founded by Christ, cannot be the true Church. This becomes even more evident when the purpose of the Divine Founder is considered. For what did Christ, the Lord, ask? What did He wish in regard to the Church founded, or about to be founded? This: to transmit to it the same mission and the same mandate which He had received from the Father, that they should be perpetuated. This he clearly

resolved to do; this He actually did. "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you," (John xx, 21). "As thou hast sent Me into the world I also have sent them into the world." (John xvii, 18).

But the mission of Christ is to save *that which had perished;* that is to say, not some nations or peoples, but the whole human race, without distinction of time or place. "The Son of Man came that the world might be saved by Him." (John iii, 17). "For there is no other name under Heaven given to men whereby we must be saved." (Acts iv, 12). The Church, therefore, is bound to communicate without stint to all men, and to transmit through all ages the salvation effected by Jesus Christ, and the blessing flowing therefrom. Wherefore, by the will of its Founder, it is necessary that this Church should be one in all lands and at all times. To justify the existence of more than one Church it would be necessary to go outside this world, and to create a new and unheard-of race of men.

That the one Church should embrace all men everywhere and at all times was seen and foretold by Isaias, when looking into the future he saw the appearance of a mountain conspicuous by its all-surpassing altitude, which set forth the image of "The House of the Lord"—that is, of the Church. "And in the last days the mountain of the House of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of the mountains." (Isa. ii, 2).

But this mountain which towers over all other mountains is *one;* and the House of the Lord to which *all nations* shall come to seek the rule of living is also *one.* "And all nations shall flow into it. And many people shall go, and say: Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the House of the God of Jacob, and He will teach us His ways, and we will walk in His paths" (*Ibid.*, ii, 2, 3).

Explaining this passage, Optatus of Milevis says: "It is written in the prophet Isaias: 'from Sion the law shall go forth and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.' For it is not on Mount Sion that Isaias sees the valley, but on the holy mountain, that is, the Church, which has raised itself

conspicuously throughout the entire Roman world under the whole heavens. . . . The Church is, therefore, the spiritual Sion in which Christ has been constituted King by God the Father, and which exists throughout the entire earth, on which there is but one Catholic Church" (*De Schism. Donatist.*, lib. iii, n. 2). And Augustine says: "What can be so manifest as a mountain, or so well known? There are, it is true, mountains which are unknown because they are situated in some remote part of the earth. . . . But this mountain is not unknown; for it has filled the whole face of the world, and about this it is said that it is prepared on the summit of the mountains." (*In Ep. Joan.*, tract i, n. 12).

V.

Furthermore, the Son of God decreed that the Church should be His mystical body, with which He would be united as the Head, after the manner of the human body which He assumed, to which the natural head is physically united. As He took to Himself a mortal body, which He gave to suffering and death in order to pay the price of man's redemption, so also He has one mystical body in which and through which He renders men partakers of holiness and of eternal salvation. God "hath made Him (Christ) head over all the Church, which is His body" (Eph. i, 22, 23). Scattered and separated members cannot possibly cohere with the head so as to make one body. But St. Paul says: "All the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ." (1 Cor. xii, 12). Wherefore this mystical body, he declares, is "compacted and fitly jointed together. The head, Christ: from whom the whole body, being compacted and fitly jointed together, by what every joint supplieth according to the operation in the measure of every part." (Eph. iv, 15, 16). And so dispersed members, separated one from the other, cannot be united with one and the same head. "There is one God, and one Christ; and His Church is one and the faith is one; and one the people, joined together in the solid unity of the body in the bond of

concord. This unity cannot be broken, nor the one body divided by the separation of its constituent parts." (S. Cyprianus, *De Cath. Eccl. Unitate*, n. 23). And to set forth more clearly the unity of the Church, he makes use of the illustration of a living body, the members of which cannot possibly live unless united to the head and drawing from it their vital force. Separated from the head they must of necessity die. "The Church," he says, "cannot be divided into parts by the separation and cutting asunder of its members. What is cut away from the mother cannot live or breathe apart." (*Ibid*). What similarity is there between a dead and a living body? "For no man ever hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth, as also Christ doth the Church: because we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." (Eph. v, 29, 30).

Another head like to Christ must be invented—that is, another Christ—if besides the one Church, which is His body, men wish to set up another. "See what you must beware of—see what you must avoid—see what you must dread. It happens that, as in the human body, some member may be cut off—a hand, a finger, a foot. Does the soul follow the amputated member? As long as it was in the body, it lived; separated, it forfeits its life. So the Christian is a Catholic as long as he lives in the body; cut off from it he becomes a heretic—the life of the spirit follows not the amputated member." (S. Augustinus, Sermo cclxvii., n. 4).

The Church of Christ, therefore, is one and the same forever; those who leave it depart from the will and command of Christ, the Lord—leaving the path of salvation they enter on that of perdition. "Whosoever is separated from the Church is united to an adulteress. He has cut himself off from the promises of the Church, and he who leaves the Church of Christ cannot arrive at the rewards of Christ. . . . He who observes not this unity observes not the law of God, holds not the faith of the Father and the Son, clings not to life and salvation." (S. Cyprianus, *De Cath. Eccl. Unitate*, n. 6).

VI.

But He, indeed, Who made this one Church, also gave it *unity*, that is, He made it such that all who are to belong to it must be united by the closest bonds, so as to form one society, one kingdom, one body—"one body and one spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling," (Eph. iv., 4). Jesus Christ, when His death was nigh at hand, declared His will in this matter, and solemnly offered it up, thus addressing His Father: "Not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in Me . . . that they also may be one in Us. . . . that they may be made perfect in one." (John xvii, 20, 21, 23). Yea, He commanded that this unity should be so closely knit and so perfect amongst His followers that it might, in some measure, shadow forth the union between Himself and His Father: "I pray that they all may be one as Thou Father in Me and I in Thee." (*Ibid.* 21).

Agreement and union of minds is the necessary foundation of this perfect concord amongst men, from which follow concurrence of wills and likeness of action as the natural results. Wherefore, in His divine wisdom, He ordained in His Church *unity of faith*; a virtue which is the first of those bonds which unite man to God, and whence we receive the name of the *faithful*—"one Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. iv., 5). That is, as there is one Lord and one baptism, so should all Christians, without exception, have but one faith. And so the Apostle, St. Paul, not merely asks, but entreats and implores Christians to be all of the same mind, and to avoid difference of opinions: "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms amongst you, and that you be perfect in the same mind and in the same judgment" (I Cor. i, 10). Such passages certainly need no interpreter; they speak clearly enough for themselves. Besides, all who profess Christianity allow that there can be but one faith. It is of the greatest importance and indeed of absolute necessity, as to which many are deceived, that the nature and character of this unity should be recognized. And,

as we have already stated, this is not to be ascertained by conjecture, but by the certain knowledge of what was done; that is by seeking for and ascertaining what kind of unity in faith has been commanded by Jesus Christ.

VII.

The heavenly doctrine of Christ, although for the most part committed to writing by divine inspiration, could not unite the minds of men if left to the human intellect alone. It would, for this very reason, be subject to various and contradictory interpretations. This is so, not only because of the nature of the doctrine itself and of the mysteries it involves, but also because of the divergencies of the human mind and of the disturbing element of conflicting passions. From a variety of interpretations a variety of beliefs is necessarily begotten; hence come controversies, dissensions and wranglings such as have arisen in the past, even in the first ages of the Church. Irenæus writes of heretics as follows: "Admitting the sacred Scriptures they distort the interpretations" (Lib. iii, cap. 12, n. 12). And Augustine: "Heresies have arisen, and certain perverse views ensnaring souls and precipitating them into the abyss only when the Scriptures, good in themselves, are not properly understood." (*In Evang. Joan*, tract xviii, cap. 5, n. 1). Besides Holy Writ it was absolutely necessary to insure this union of men's minds—to effect and preserve unity of ideas—that there should be another *principle*. This, the wisdom of God requires; for He could not have willed that the faith should be *one* if He did not provide means sufficient for the preservation of this unity; and this Holy Writ clearly sets forth as we shall presently point out. Assuredly the infinite power of God is not bound by anything, all things obey it as so many passive instruments. In regard to this external principle, therefore, we must inquire which one of all the means in His power Christ did actually adopt. For this purpose it is necessary to recall in thought the institution of Christianity.

VIII.

We are mindful only of what is witnessed to by Holy Writ and what is otherwise well known. Christ proves His own divinity and the divine origin of His mission by miracles; He teaches the multitudes heavenly doctrine by word of mouth; and He absolutely commands that the assent of faith should be given to His teaching, promising eternal rewards to those who believe and eternal punishment to those who do not. "If I do not the works of my Father, believe Me not." (John x, 37). "If I had not done among them the works than no other man had done, they would not have sin." (*Ibid.* xv, 24). "But if I do (the works) though you will not believe Me, believe the works." (*Ibid.* x, 38). Whatsoever He commands, He commands by the same authority. He requires the assent of the mind to all truths without exception. It was thus the duty of all who heard Jesus Christ, if they wished for eternal salvation, not merely to accept His doctrine as a whole, but to assent with their entire mind to all and every point of it, since it is unlawful to withhold faith from God even in regard to one single point.

When about to ascend into heaven He sends His Apostles in virtue of the same power by which He had been sent from the Father; and he charges them to spread abroad and propagate His teaching: "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth. Going therefore teach all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt. xxviii, 18, 19, 20). So that those obeying the Apostles might be saved, and those disobeying should perish. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned," (Mark xvi, 16). But since it is obviously most in harmony with God's providence that He should not have confided to anyone a great and important mission unless He furnished him with the means of properly carrying it out, for this reason Christ promised that He would send the Spirit of Truth to His Disciples to remain with them forever. "But if I go I will send Him (the Paraclete) to you. . . . But when He, the Spirit of Truth is come, He will teach you all truth." (John

xvi, 7-13). "And I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you forever, the Spirit of Truth." (*Ibid.* xiv, 16, 17). "He shall give testimony of Me, and you shall give testimony" (*Ibid.* xv, 26, 27). Hence He commands that the teaching of the Apostles should be religiously accepted and piously kept as if it were His own—"He who hears you hears Me, he who despises you despises me" (Luke x, 16). Wherefore the Apostles are ambassadors of Christ as He is the ambassador of the Father. "As the Father sent Me so also I send you," (John xx, 21). Hence as the Apostles and Disciples were bound to obey Christ, so also those whom the Apostles taught were, by God's command, bound to obey them. And, therefore, it was no more allowable to repudiate one iota of the Apostles' teaching than it was to reject any point of the doctrine of Christ Himself.

Truly the voice of the Apostles, when the Holy Ghost had come down upon them, resounded throughout the world. Wherever they went they proclaimed themselves the ambassadors of Christ Himself. "By whom (Jesus Christ) we have received grace and Apostleship for obedience to the faith in all nations for His name" (Rom. i, 5). And God makes known their divine mission by numerous miracles. "But they going forth preached everywhere; the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed," (Mark xvi, 20). But what is this word? That which comprehends all things, that which they had learnt from their Master; because they openly and publicly declare that they cannot help speaking of what they had seen and heard.

But, as we have already said, the Apostolic mission was not destined to die with the Apostles themselves, or to come to an end in the course of time, since it was intended for the people at large and instituted for the salvation of the human race. For Christ commanded His Apostles to preach the "Gospel to every creature, to carry His name to nations and kings, and to be witnesses to Him to the ends of the earth." He further promised to assist them in the fulfilment of their high mission, and that, not for a few years or centuries only,

but for all time—"even to the consummation of the world." Upon which St. Jerome says: "He who promises to remain with His Disciples to the end of the world declares that they will be forever victorious, and that He will never depart from those who believe in Him" (In Matt., lib. iv, cap. 28, v. 20). But how could all this be realized in the Apostles alone, placed as they were under the universal law of dissolution by death? It was consequently provided by God that the *Magisterium* instituted by Jesus Christ should not end with the life of the Apostles, but that it should be perpetuated. We see it in truth propagated, and, as it were, delivered from hand to hand. For the Apostles consecrated Bishops, and each one appointed those who were to succeed them immediately "in the ministry of the word."

Nay more: They likewise required their successors to choose fitting men, to endow them with like authority, and to confide to them the office and mission of teaching. "Thou, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace which is in Christ Jesus; and the things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same command to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii, 1-2). Wherefore, as Christ was sent by God and the Apostles by Christ, so the Bishops and those who succeeded them were sent by the Apostles. "The Apostles were appointed by Christ to preach the Gospel to us. Jesus Christ was sent by God. Christ is therefore from God, and the Apostles from Christ, and both according to the will of God. . . . Preaching therefore the word through the countries and cities, when they had proved in the Spirit the first fruits of their teaching they appointed Bishops and deacons for the faithful. . . . They appointed them and then ordained them, so that when they themselves had passed away other tried men should carry on their ministry." (S. Clemens Rom. *Epist. I ad Corinth.* capp. 42, 44). On the one hand, therefore, it is necessary that the mission of teaching whatever Christ had taught should remain perpetual and immutable, and on the other that the duty of accepting and professing all their doctrine should likewise be perpetual and immut-

able. "Our Lord Jesus Christ, when in His Gospel He testifies that those who are not with Him are His enemies, does not designate any special form of heresy, but declares that all heretics who are not with Him and do not gather with Him, scatter His flock and are His adversaries; he that is not with Me is against Me, and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth." (S. Cyprianus, Ep. lxix, ad Magnum, n. 1).

IX.

The Church, founded on these principles and mindful of her office, has in nothing shown greater zeal and endeavor than in her efforts to guard the integrity of the faith. Hence she regarded as rebels and expelled from the ranks of her children all who held beliefs on any point of doctrine different from her own. The Arians, the Montanists, the Novatians, the Quartodecimans, the Eutychians, did not certainly reject all Catholic doctrine; they abandoned only a certain portion of it. Still who does not know that they were declared heretics and banished from the bosom of the Church? In like manner were condemned all authors of heretical tenets who followed them in subsequent ages. "There can be nothing more dangerous than those heretics who admit nearly the whole cycle of doctrine, and yet by one word, as with a drop of poison, infect the true and simple faith taught by our Lord and handed down by Apostolic tradition" (Auctor *Tract. de Fide Orthodoxa contra Arianos*).

The practice of the Church has always been the same, as is shown by the unanimous teaching of the Fathers, who were wont to hold as outside Catholic communion, and alien to the Church, him who would recede in the least degree from any point of doctrine proposed by her authoritative Magisterium. Epiphanius, Augustine, Theodoret, drew up a long list of the heresies of their times. St. Augustine notes that other heresies may spring up, to a single one of which, should any one give his assent, he is by the very fact cut off from Catholic unity. "No one who merely disbelieves in all (these heresies) can for that reason regard himself as a Cath-

olic or call himself one. For there may be or may arise some other heresies, which are not set out in this work of ours, and, if any one holds to one single one of these he is not a Catholic." (S. Augustinus, *De Haeresibus*, n. 88).

The need of this divinely instituted means for the preservation of unity, about which we speak, is urged by St. Paul in his epistle to the Ephesians. In this he first admonishes them to preserve with every care concord of minds: "Solicitous to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." (Eph. iv, *3 et seq.*). And as souls cannot be perfectly united in charity unless minds agree in faith, He wishes all to hold the same faith: "One Lord, one faith," and this so perfectly *one* as to prevent all danger of error: "That henceforth we be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness, by which they lie in wait to deceive," (Eph. iv, 14); and this he teaches is to be observed, not for a time only—"but until we all meet in the unity of faith . . . unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ." (13). But, in what has Christ placed the primary principle, and the means of preserving this unity? In that—"He gave some Apostles—and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." (11, 12).

Wherefore, from the very earliest times the Fathers and Doctors of the Church have been accustomed to follow and, with one accord to defend this rule. Origen writes: "As often as the heretics allege the possession of the canonical scriptures, to which all Christians give unanimous assent, they seem to say: 'Behold the word of truth is in the houses.' But we should believe them not and abandon not the primary and ecclesiastical tradition. We should not believe otherwise than has been handed down by the tradition of the Church of God," (*Vetus Interpretatio Commentariorum in Matt.* n. 46). Irenæus too says: "The doctrine of the Apostles is the true faith . . . which is known to us through the Episcopal succession . . . which has reached even unto our age by the very fact that the Scriptures have

been zealously guarded and fully interpreted," (*Contra Haereses*, lib. iv, cap. 33, n. 8). And Tertullian: "It is therefore clear that all doctrine which agrees with that of the Apostolic churches—the parent-stock and original centres of the faith, must be regarded as the truth, holding without hesitation that the Church received it from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ and Christ from God. . . . We are in communion with the Apostolic churches, and by the very fact that they agree amongst themselves we have testimony of the truth," (*De Præscrip.*, cap. xxxi). And so Hilary: "Christ teaching from the ship signifies that those who are outside the Church can never grasp the divine teaching; for the ship typifies the Church where the word of life is deposited and preached. Those who are outside are like sterile and worthless sand: they cannot comprehend." (*Comment. in Matt.* xiii, n. 1). Rufinus praises Gregory of Nazianzum and Basil because "they studied the text of Holy Scripture, but they took the interpretation of its meaning not from their own inner consciousness, but from the writings and on the authority of the ancients, who in their turn, as is clear, took their rule for understanding its meaning from the Apostolic succession." (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii, cap. 9).

Wherefore, as appears from what has been said, Christ instituted in the Church *a living*, *authoritative* and *permanent Magisterium*, which He strengthened by His own power taught, by the Spirit of truth, and confirmed by miracles. He willed and ordered, under the gravest penalties, that its teachings should be received as if it were His own. As often, therefore, as it is declared on the authority of His teaching that this or that is contained in the deposit of divine revelation, it must be believed by every one as true. If it could in any way be false, an evident contradiction follows; for then God Himself would be the author of error in man. "Lord, if we be in error, we are being deceived by Thee" (Richardus de S. Victore, *De Trin.*, lib. i., cap. 2). In this wise, all cause for doubting being removed, can it be lawful for anyone to reject even one of those truths without by the very fact falling into heresy?—without

separating himself from the Church?—without repudiating in one sweeping act the whole of Christian teaching? For such is the nature of faith that nothing can be more absurd than to accept some things and reject others. Faith, as the Church teaches, is "that supernatural virtue by which, through the help of God and through the assistance of His grace, we believe what He has revealed to be true, not on account of the intrinsic truth perceived by the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God Himself, the Revealer, who can neither deceive nor be deceived," (Conc. Vat., Sess. iii, cap. 3). If then it be certain that anything is revealed by God, and this is not believed, then nothing whatever is believed by divine faith: for what the Apostle St. James judges to be the effect of a moral delinquency, the same is to be said of an erroneous opinion in the matter of faith. "Whosoever shall offend in one point, is become guilty of all" (Ep. James ii, 10). Nay, it applies with greater force to an erroneous opinion. For it can be said with less truth that every law is violated by one who commits a single sin, since it may be that he only indirectly despises the majesty of God the Legislator. But he who dissents even in one point from divinely revealed truth absolutely rejects all faith, since he thereby refuses to honor God as the supreme truth and *formal motive of credibility*. "In many things they are with me, in a few things not with me; but in those few things in which they are not with me the many things in which they are will not profit them." (S. Augustinus *in Psal.* liv, n. 19). And this indeed most deservedly; for they, who take from Christian doctrine what they please, lean on their own judgments, not on faith; and not "bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ" (2 Cor. x, 5), they more truly obey themselves than God. "You, who believe what you like of the gospels and disbelieve what you like, believe yourselves rather than the gospel" (S. Augustinus, lib. xvii, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* cap 3).

For this reason the Fathers of the Vatican Council laid down nothing new, but followed divine revelation and the

acknowledged and invariable teaching of the Church as to the very nature of faith, when they decreed as follows: "All those things are to be believed by divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the written or unwritten word of God, and which are proposed by the Church as divinely revealed, either by a solemn definition or in the exercise of its ordinary and universal Magisterium" (Sess. iii, cap 3). Hence, since God absolutely and evidently willed that there should be unity in His Church, and as it is clear what kind of unity He willed, and by means of what principle He ordained that this unity should be maintained, we may address the following words of St. Augustine to all who have not deliberately closed their minds to the truth: "When we see the great help of God, such manifest progress and such abundant fruit, shall we hesitate to take refuge in the bosom of the Church, which, as is evident to all, possesses the supreme authority of the Apostolic See through the Episcopal succession? In vain do heretics rage round it; they are condemned partly by the judgment of the people themselves, partly by the weight of councils, partly by the splendid evidence of miracles. To refuse to the Church the primacy is most impious and above measure arrogant. And if all learning, no matter how easy and common it may be, in order to be fully understood requires a teacher and master, what can be greater evidence of pride and rashness than to be unwilling to learn about the books of the divine mysteries from the proper interpreter, and to wish to condemn them without knowledge?" (*De Unitate Credendi;* cap. xvii, n. 35).

It is then undoubtedly the office of the Church to guard Christian doctrine and to propagate it in its integrity and purity. But this is not all: the object for which the Church has been instituted is not wholly attained by the performance of this duty. For, since Jesus Christ delivered Himself up for the salvation of the human race, and to this end directed all His teaching and commands, so He ordered the Church to strive, by the truth of His doctrine, to sanctify and to save mankind. But faith alone cannot compass so great, excel-

lent, and important an end. There must needs be also the fitting and devout worship of God, which is to be found chiefly in the divine Sacrifice and in the dispensation of the Sacraments, as well as salutary laws and discipline. All these must be found in the Church, since it continues the mission of the Saviour forever. The Church alone offers to the human race that religion—that state of absolute perfection—which He wished, as it were, to be *incorporated* in it. And it alone supplies those means of salvation which accord with the ordinary counsels of Providence.

X.

But as this heavenly doctrine was never left to the arbitrary judgment of private individuals, but, in the beginning delivered by Jesus Christ, was afterwards committed by Him exclusively to the *Magisterium* already named, so the power of performing and administering the divine mysteries, together with the authority of ruling and governing, was not bestowed by God on all Christians indiscriminately, but on certain chosen persons. For to the Apostles and their legitimate successors alone these words have reference: "Going into the whole world preach the Gospel." "Baptizing them." "Do this in commemoration of Me." "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them." And in like manner He ordered the Apostles only and those who should lawfully succeed them to *feed*—that is to govern with authority—all Christian souls. Whence it also follows that it is necessarily the duty of Christians to be subject and to obey. And these duties of the Apostolic office are, in general all included in the words of St. Paul: "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. iv, 1).

Wherefore Jesus Christ bade all men, present and future, follow Him as their leader and Saviour; and this, not merely as individuals, but as forming a society, organized and united in mind. In this way a duly-constituted society should exist, formed out of the divided multitude of peoples, one in faith, one in aim, one in the participation of the

means adapted to the attainment of the aim, and one as subject to one and the same authority. To this end He established in the Church all those principles which necessarily tend to create organized human societies, and through which they attain the perfection proper to each. Thus in and through the Church all who wished to be the sons of God by adoption might attain to the perfection demanded by their high calling, and might obtain salvation. The Church, therefore, as we have said, is man's guide to whatever pertains to Heaven. This is the office appointed unto it by God: that it may watch over and may order all that concerns religion, and may, without let or hindrance, exercise, according to its judgment, its charge over christianity. Those who on this account pretend that the Church has any wish to interfere in civil matters, or to infringe upon the rights of the state, know it not, or wrongly calumniate it.

God indeed has made the Church a society far more perfect than any other. For the end for which the Church exists is as much higher than the end of other societies as divine grace is above nature, as immortal blessings are above the transitory things of the earth. Therefore the Church is a society *divine* in its origin, *supernatural* in its end and in the means proximately adapted to the attainment of that end; but it is a *human* community inasmuch as it is composed of men. For this reason we find it called in Holy Writ by names indicating a perfect society. It is spoken of as *the House of God*, *the city placed upon the mountain* to which all nations must come. But it is also the *fold* presided over by one Shepherd, and into which all Christ's sheep must betake themselves. Yea, it is called *the kingdom which God has raised up* and which *will stand forever.* Finally it is the *body of Christ*—that is, of course, His *mystical* body, but a body living and duly organized and composed of many members; members indeed which have not all the same functions, but which, united one to the other, are kept bound together by the guidance and authority of the head.

Indeed no true and perfect human society can be con-

ceived which is not governed by some supreme authority. Christ therefore must have given to His Church a supreme authority to which all Christians are to render obedience. For this reason, as the unity of the faith is of necessity required for the unity of the Church, inasmuch as it is the *body of the faithful*, so also for this same unity, inasmuch as the Church is a divinely constituted society, unity of government, which effects and involves *unity of communion*, is necessary *jure divino*. "The unity of the Church is manifested in the mutual connection or communication of its members, and likewise in the relation of all the members of the Church to one head," (St. Thomas, 2a 2æ, 9, xxxix, a. 1).

From this it is easy to see that men can fall away from the unity of the Church by schism, as well as by heresy. "We think that this difference exists between heresy and schism" (writes St. Jerome): "heresy has no perfect dogmatic teaching, whereas schism, through some Episcopal dissent, also separates from the Church," (S. Hieronymus, *Comment. in Epist. ad Titum*, cap. iii, v. 10, 11). In which judgment St. John Chrysostom concurs: "I say and protest (he writes) that it is as wrong to separate from the Church as to fall into heresy," (Hom. xi, *in Epist. ad Ephes.*, n. 5). Wherefore as no heresy can ever be justifiable, so in like manner there can be no justification for schism. "There is nothing more grievous than the sacrilege of schism . . . there can be no just necessity for destroying the unity of the Church," (S. Augustinus, *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*, lib. ii, cap. ii, n. 25).

XI.

The nature of this supreme authority, which all Christians are bound to obey, can be ascertained only by finding out what was the evident and positive will of Christ. Certainly Christ is a King forever; and though invisible, He continues unto the end of time to govern and guard His Church from Heaven. But since He willed that His kingdom should be visible, He was obliged, when He ascended into Heaven, to designate a vice-gerent on earth. "Should anyone say that

Christ is the one head and the one shepherd, the one spouse of the one Church, he does not give an adequate reply. It is clear, indeed, that Christ is the author of grace in the Sacraments of the Church ; it is Christ Himself who baptizes ; it is He who forgives sins ; it is He who is the true priest who hath offered Himself upon the altar of the cross, and it is by His power that His body is daily consecrated upon the altar ; and still, because He was not to be visibly present to all the faithful, He made choice of ministers through whom the aforesaid Sacraments should be dispensed to the faithful as said above" (cap. 74.). "For the same reason, therefore, because He was about to withdraw His visible presence from the Church, it was necessary that He should appoint someone in His place, to have the charge of the Universal Church. Hence, before His Ascension, He said to Peter : 'Feed my sheep.'" (St. Thomas, *Contra Gentiles*, lib. iv, cap. 76).

Jesus Christ, therefore, appointed Peter as head of the Church ; and He also determined that the authority instituted in perpetuity for the salvation of all should be inherited by His successors, in whom the same permanent authority of Peter himself should continue. And therefore He made that remarkable promise to Peter and to no one else : "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church." (Matt. xvi, 18). "To Peter the Lord spoke : to *one*, therefore, that He might establish unity upon one." (S. Pacianus ad Sempronium, Ep. iii, n. 11). "Without any prelude he mentions St. Peter's name and that of his father (Blessed art thou Simon, son of John) and He does not wish Him to be called Simon any longer ; claiming him for Himself, according to His divine authority, He aptly names him Peter, from *petra* the rock, since upon him He was about to found His Church." (S. Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *In Evang. Joan.*, lib. ii, in cap. i, v. 42).

XII.

From this text it is clear that by the will and command of God the Church rests upon St. Peter, just as a building rests on its foundation. Now the proper nature of a foundation is

to be a principle of cohesion for the various parts of the building. It must be the necessary condition of stability and strength. Remove it and the whole building falls. It is consequently the office of St. Peter to support the Church, and to guard it in all its strength and indestructible unity. How could he fulfil this office without the power of commanding, forbidding, and judging, which is properly called *jurisdiction?* It is only by this power of jurisdiction that nations and commonwealths are held together. A primacy of honor and the shadowy right of giving advice and admonition, which is called *direction*, could never secure to any society of men unity or strength. The words—*and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it*—proclaim and establish the authority of which we speak. "What is the *it?*" (writes Origen). "Is it the rock upon which Christ builds the Church or the Church? The expression indeed is ambiguous, as if the rock and the Church were one and the same. I indeed think that this is so, and that neither against the rock upon which Christ builds His Church nor against the Church shall the gates of Hell prevail," (Origenes, *Comment. in Matt.*, tom. xii, n. ii). The meaning of this divine utterance is, that, notwithstanding the wiles and intrigues which they bring to bear against the Church, it can never be that the Church committed to the care of Peter shall succumb or in any wise fail. "For the Church, as the edifice of Christ who has wisely built 'His house upon a rock,' cannot be conquered by the gates of Hell, which may prevail over any man who shall be off the rock and outside the Church, but shall be powerless against it." (*Ibid.*). Therefore God confided His Church to Peter so that he might safely guard it with his unconquerable power. He invested him, therefore, with the needful authority; since the right to rule is absolutely required by him who has to guard human society really and effectively. This promise, also, Christ made: "To thee will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." And He is clearly still speaking of the Church, which a short time before He had called *His own*, and which He declared He wished to build on Peter as on a foundation. The

Church is typified not only as an *edifice* but as a *kingdom*, and everyone knows that the keys constitute the usual sign of governing authority. Wherefore when Christ promised to give to Peter the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, He promised to give him power and authority over the Church. "The Son committed to Peter the office of spreading the knowledge of His Father and Himself over the whole world. He who increased the Church on all the earth, and proclaimed it to be stronger than the heavens, gave to a mortal man all power in heaven when He handed him the keys," (S. Johannes Chrysostomus, Hom. liv., in Matt. v. 2). In this same sense He says: "Whatsoever thou shall bind upon earth it shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth it shall be loosed also in heaven." This metaphorical expression of binding and loosing indicates the power of making laws, of judging and of punishing; and the power is said to be of such amplitude and force that God will ratify whatever is decreed by it. Thus it is supreme and absolutely independent, so that, having no other power on earth as its superior, it embraces the whole Church and all things committed to the Church.

The promise is carried out when Christ the Lord after His resurrection, having thrice asked Peter whether he loved Him more than the rest, lays on him the injunction: "Feed my lambs—feed my sheep." That is He confides to him, without exception, all those who were to belong to His fold. "The Lord does not hesitate. He interrogates, not to learn but to teach. When He was about to ascend into Heaven He left us, as it were, a vice-regent of His love. . . . and so because Peter alone of all others professes his love he is preferred to all—that being the most perfect he should govern the more perfect," (S. Ambrosius, *Exposit. in Evang. secundum Lucam*, lib. x, nn. 175, 176).

These, then, are the duties of a shepherd: to place himself as leader at the head of his flock, to provide proper food for it, to ward off dangers, to guard against insiduous foes, to defend it against violence; in a word to rule and govern it. Since, therefore, Peter has been placed as shepherd of the

Christian flock he has received the power of governing all men for whose salvation Jesus Christ shed His blood. "Why has He shed His blood? To buy the sheep which He handed over to Peter and his successors," (S. Joannes Chrysostomus, *De Sacerdotio*, lib. ii.).

And since all Christians must be closely united in the communion of one immutable faith, Christ the Lord, by virtue of His prayers, obtained for Peter that in the fulfiment of his office he should never fall away from the faith. "But I have asked for thee that thy faith fail not," (Luke xxii, 32), and He furthermore commanded him to impart light and strength to his brethren as often as the need should arise: "Confirm thy brethren," (*Ibid.*). He willed then that he whom He had designated as the foundation of the Church should be the defence of its faith. "Could not Christ who confided to him the Kingdom by His own authority have strengthened the faith of one whom He designated a rock to show the foundation of the Church?" (S. Ambrosius, *De Fide*, lib. iv, n. 56). For this reason Jesus Christ willed that Peter should participate in certain names, signs of great things which properly belong to Himself alone: in order that identity of titles should show identity of power. So He who is Himself "the chief corner-stone in whom all the building being framed together, groweth up in a holy temple in the Lord," (Eph. ii, 21) placed Peter as it were *a stone* to support the Church. "When he heard 'thou art a rock,' he was ennobled by the announcement. Although he is a rock, not as Christ is a rock, but as Peter is a rock. For Christ is by His very being an immovable rock; Peter only through this rock. Christ imparts His gifts, and is not exhausted. . . . He is a priest, and makes priests. He is a rock, and constitutes a rock," (Hom. *de Poenitentia*, n. 4, in Appendice opp. S. Basilii). He who is the King of His Church, "Who hath the key of David, who openeth and no man shutteth, who shutteth and no man openeth, (Apoc. iii, 7) having delivered *the keys* to Peter declared him Prince of the Christian commonwealth. So, too, He, the Great Shepherd, who calls Himself "the Good Shepherd," constituted

Peter the pastor "of His lambs and sheep. Feed My lambs, feed My sheep." Wherefore Chrysostom says: "He was pre-eminent among the Apostles: He was the mouthpiece of the Apostles and the head of the Apostolic College . . . . at the same time showing him that henceforth he ought to have confidence, and as it were blotting out his denial, He commits to him the government of his brethren. . . . He saith to him: 'If thou lovest Me, be over my brethren.' Finally He who confirms in "every good work and word," (2 Thess. ii, 16) commands Peter "to confirm his brethren."

Rightly, therefore, does St. Leo the Great say: "From the whole world Peter alone is chosen to take the lead in calling all nations, to be the head of all the Apostles and of all the Fathers of the Church. So that, although among the people of God there are many priests and many pastors Peter should by right rule all of those over whom Christ Himself is the chief ruler," (Sermo iv, cap. 2). And so St. Gregory the Great, writing to the Emperor Maurice Augustus, says: "It is evident to all who know the Gospel that the charge of the whole Church was committed to St. Peter, the Apostle and Prince of all the Apostles, by the word of the Lord. . . . Behold! he hath received the keys of the heavenly kingdom —the power of binding and loosing is conferred upon him: the care of the whole Government of the Church is confided to him," (Epist. lib. v, Epist. xx).

XIII.

It was necessary that a government of this kind, since it belongs to the constitution and formation of the Church, as its principal element—that is as the principle of unity and the foundation of lasting stability—should in no wise come to an end with St. Peter, but should pass to his successors from one to another. "There remains, therefore, the ordinance of truth, and St. Peter, persevering in the strength of the rock which he had received, hath not abandoned the government of the Church which had been confided to him," (S. Leo M. sermo iii, cap. 3). For this reason the Pontiffs who succeed Peter in the Roman Episcopate receive the

supreme power in the Church, *jure divino*." "We define" (declare the Fathers of the Council of Florence) "that the Holy and Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff holds the primacy of the Church throughout the whole world: and that the same Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the true Vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that full power was given to him, in Blessed Peter, by our Lord Jesus Christ to feed, to rule, and to govern the universal Church, as is also contained in the acts of œcumenical councils and in the sacred canons," (*Conc. Florentinum*). Similarly the Fourth Council of Lateran declares: "The Roman Church, as the mother and mistress of all the faithful, by the will of Christ obtains primacy of jurisdiction over all other Churches." These declarations were preceded by the consent of antiquity which ever acknowledged, without the slightest doubt or hesitation, the Bishops of Rome, and revered them, as the legitimate successors of St. Peter.

Who is unaware of the many and evident testimonies of the holy Fathers which exist to this effect? Most remarkable is that of St. Irenæus who, referring to the Roman Church, says: "With this Church, on account of its preeminent authority, it is necessary that every Church should be in concord," (*Contra Haereses*, lib. iii, cap. 3, n. 2); and St. Cyprian also says of the Roman Church, that "it is the root and mother of the Catholic Church, the chair of Peter, and the principal Church whence sacerdotal unity has its source," (Ep. xlviii, ad Cornelium, n. 3, and Ep. lix, ad eundem, n. 14). He calls it *the chair of Peter* because it is occupied by the successor of Peter: he calls it the *principal Church*, on account of the primacy conferred on Peter himself and his legitimate successors; and *the source of unity*, because the Roman Church is the efficient cause of unity in the Christian commonwealth. For this reason Jerome addresses Damasus thus: "My words are spoken to the successor of the Fisherman, to the disciple of the Cross. . . . I communicate with none save your Blessedness, that is with

the chair of Peter. For this I know is the rock on which the Church is built," (Ep. xv, ad Damasum, n. 2). Union with the Roman See of Peter is to him always the public criterion of Catholicity. "I acknowledge every one who is united with the See of Peter," (Ep. xvi, ad Damasum, n. 2). And for a like reason St. Augustine publicly attests that, "the primacy of the Apostolic chair always existed in the Roman Church," (Ep. xliii, n. 7); and he denies that any one who dissents from the Roman faith can be a Catholic. "You are not to be looked upon as holding the true Catholic faith if you do not teach that the faith of Rome is to be held," (Sermo cxx, n. 13). So, too, St. Cyprian: "To be in communion with Cornelius is to be in communion with the Catholic Church," (Ep. lv, n. 1). In the same way Maximus, the Abbot, teaches that obedience to the Roman Pontiff is the proof of the true faith and of legitimate communion. Therefore if a man does not want to be, or to be called, a heretic, let him not strive to please this or that man . . . . but let him hasten before all things to be in communion with the Roman See. If he be in communion with it, he should be acknowledged by all and everywhere as faithful and orthodox. He speaks in vain, who tries to persuade me of the orthodoxy of those who, like himself, refuse obedience to his Holiness the Pope of the most holy Church of Rome: that is to the Apostolic See." The reason and motive of this he explains to be that "the Apostolic See has received and hath government, authority and power of binding and loosing from the Incarnate Word Himself; and, according to all holy synods, sacred canons and decrees, in all things and through all things, in respect of all the holy churches of God throughout the whole world, since the Word in Heaven who rules the heavenly powers binds and loosens there," (*Defloratio ex Epistola ad Petrum illustrem*).

Wherefore what was acknowledged and observed as Christian faith, not by one nation only nor in one age, but by the East and by the West, and through all ages, this Philip, the priest, the Pontifical legate at the Council of Ephesus, no voice being raised in dissent, recalls: "No one can doubt,

yea, it is known unto all ages, that St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith and the ground of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ. That is: the power of forgiving and retaining sins was given to him who, up to the present time, lives and exercises judgment in the persons of his successors," (Actio iii). The pronouncement of the Council of Chalcedon on the same matter is present to the minds of all: "Peter has spoken through Leo," (Actio ii), to which the voice of the Third Council of Constantinople responds as an echo: "The chief Prince of the Apostles was fighting on our side: for we have had as our ally his follower and the successor to his see: and the paper and the ink were seen, and Peter spoke through Agatho," (Actio xviii).

In the formula of Catholic faith drawn up and proposed by Hormisdas, which was subscribed at the beginning of the sixth century in the great Eighth Council by the Emperor Justinian, by Epiphanius, John and Menna, the Patriarchs, the same fact is declared with great weight and solemnity. "For the pronouncement of Our Lord Jesus Christ saying: '*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church*,' etc., cannot be passed over. What is said is proved by the result, because Catholic faith has always been preserved without stain in the Apostolic See," (Post Epistolam xxvi, ad omnes Episc. Hispan., n. 4). We have no wish to quote every available declaration; but it is well to recall the formula of faith which Michael Paleologus professed in the Second Council of Lyons: "The same holy Roman Church possesses the sovereign and plenary primacy and authority over the whole Catholic Church, which, truly and humbly, it acknowledges to have received together with the plentitude of power from the Lord Himself, in the person of St. Peter, the Prince or Head of the Apostles, of whom the Roman Pontiff is the successor. And as it is bound to defend the truth of faith beyond all others, so also if any question should arise concerning the faith it must be determined by its judgment," (Actio iv).

XIV.

But if the authority of Peter and his successors is plenary and supreme, it is not to be regarded as the sole authority. For He who made Peter the foundation of the Church also "chose twelve, whom He called apostles," (Luke vi, 13); and just as it is necessary that the authority of Peter should be perpetuated in the Roman Pontiff, so, by the fact that the bishops succeed the Apostles, they inherit their ordinary power, and thus the episcopal order necessarily belongs to the essential constitution of the Church. Although they do not receive plenary, or universal, or supreme authority, they are not to be looked on as *vicars* of the Roman Pontiffs; because they exercise a power really their own, and are most truly called the *ordinary* pastors of the people over whom they rule.

But since the successor of Peter is one, and those of the Apostles are many, it is necessary to examine into the relations which exist between him and them according to the divine constitution of the Church. Above all things the need of union between the bishops and the successors of Peter is clear and undeniable. This bond once broken, Christians would be separated and scattered, and would in no wise form one body and one flock. "The safety of the Church depends on the dignity of the chief priest, to whom if an extraordinary and supreme power is not given, there are as many schisms to be expected in the Church as there are priests," (S. Hieronymus, *Dialog. contra Luciferianos*, n. 9). It is necessary, therefore, to bear this in mind, viz., that nothing was conferred on the apostles apart from Peter, but that several things were conferred upon Peter apart from the Apostles. St. John Chrysostom in explaining the words of Christ asks: "Why, passing over the others, does He speak to Peter about these things?" And he replies unhesitatingly and at once, "Because he was pre-eminent among the Apostles, the mouthpiece of the Disciples, and the head of the college," (Hom. lxxxviii, *in Joan.*, n. 1). He alone was designated as the foundation of the Church. To him He gave the power of *binding* and *loosing;* to him alone was

given the power of *feeding*. On the other hand, whatever authority and office the Apostles received, they received in conjunction with Peter. "If the divine benignity willed anything to be in common between him and the other princes, whatever He did not deny to the others He gave only through him. So that whereas Peter alone received many things, He conferred nothing on any of the rest without Peter participating in it," (S. Leo M. sermo iv, cap. 2).

XV.

From this it must be clearly understood that Bishops are deprived of the right and power of ruling, if they deliberately secede from Peter and his successors; because, by this secession, they are separated from the foundation on which the whole edifice must rest. They are therefore outside the *edifice* itself; and for this very reason they are separated from the *fold*, whose leader is the Chief Pastor; they are exiled from the *Kingdom*, the keys of which were given by Christ to Peter alone.

These things enable us to see the heavenly ideal, and the divine exemplar, of the constitution of the christian commonwealth, namely: When the Divine Founder decreed that the Church should be one in faith, in government and in communion, He chose Peter and his successors as the principle and centre, as it were, of this unity. Wherefore St. Cyprian says: "The following is a short and easy proof of the faith. The Lord saith to Peter: 'I say to thee thou art Peter;' on him alone He buildeth His Church; and although after His Resurrection He gives a similar power to all the Apostles and says: 'As the Father hath sent me,' etc., still in order to make the necessary unity clear, by His own authority He laid down the source of that unity as beginning from one," (*De Unit. Eccl.*, n. 4). And Optatus of Milevis says: "You cannot deny that you know that in the city of Rome the Episcopal chair was first conferred on Peter. In this chair Peter, head of all the Apostles (whence his name Cephas), has sat; in which chair alone unity was to be preserved for all, lest any of the other apostles should

claim anything as exclusively his own. So much so, that he who would place another chair against that one chair, would be a schismatic and a sinner," (*De Schism. Donat.*, lib. ii). Hence the teaching of Cyprian, that heresy and schism arise and are begotten from the fact that due obedience is refused to the supreme authority. "Heresies and schisms have no other origin than that obedience is refused to the priest of God, and that men lose sight of the fact that there is one judge in the place of Christ in this world," (Epist. xii, ad Cornelium, n. 5). No one, therefore, unless in communion with Peter can share in his authority, since it is absurd to imagine that he who is outside can command in the Church. Wherefore Optatus of Milevis blamed the Donatists for this reason: "Against which gates (of hell) we read that Peter that is to say, our prince, received the saving keys, to whom it was said by Christ: 'To thee will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the gates of Hell shall not conquer them.' Whence is it therefore that you strive to obtain for yourselves the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven—you who fight against the chair of Peter?" (Lib. ii, n. 4, 5).

But the Episcopal order is rightly judged to be in communion with Peter, as Christ commanded, if it be subject to and obeys Peter; otherwise it necessarily becomes a lawless and disorderly sect. It is not sufficient for the due preservation of the unity of the faith that the head should merely have been charged with the office of superintendent, or should have been invested solely with a power of direction. But it is absolutely necessary that he should have received real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey. What had the Son of God in view when he promised the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to Peter *alone? Biblical usage* and the unanimous teaching of the Fathers clearly show that supreme authority is designated in the passage by the word *keys*. Nor is it lawful to interpret in a different sense what was given to Peter alone, and what was given to the other Apostles conjointly with him. If the power of binding, loosening and feeding confers upon each and every one of the Bishops, the successors

of the Apostles, a real authority to rule the people committed to him, certainly the same power must have the same effect in his case to whom the duty of feeding the lambs and sheep has been assigned bv God. "Christ constituted [Peter] not only pastor, but pastor of pastors; Peter therefore feeds the lambs and feeds the sheep, feeds the children and feeds the mothers, governs the subjects and rules the prelates, because the lambs and the sheep form the whole of the Church," (S. Brunonis Episcopi Signiensis *Comment. in Joan.*, part iii, cap. 21, n. 55). Hence those remarkable expressions of the ancients concerning St. Peter, which most clearly set forth the fact that he was placed in the highest degree of dignity and authority. They frequently call him "the Prince of the College of the Disciples; the Prince of the holy Apostles; the leader of that choir; the mouthpiece of all the Apostles; the head of that family; the ruler of the whole world; the first of the Apostles; the safeguard of the Church." In this sense St. Bernard writes as follows to Pope Eugenius: "Who art thou? The great priest—the high priest. Thou art the Prince of Bishops and the heir of the Apostles. . . . Thou art he to whom the keys were given. There are, it is true, other gatekeepers of heaven and other pastors of flocks, but thou art so much the more eminent as thou hast inherited a different and more glorious name than all the rest. They have flocks consigned to them, one to each; to thee all the flocks are confided as one flock to one shepherd, and not alone the sheep, but the shepherds. You ask how I prove this? From the words of the Lord. To which—I do not say—of the Bishops, but even of the Apostles have all the sheep been so absolutely and unreservedly committed? If thou lovest me, Peter, feed my sheep. Which sheep? Of this or that people, of this city, or country, or kingdom? *My* sheep, He says: to whom therefore is it not evident that he does not designate some, but all? We can make no exception where no distinction is made," (*De Consideratione*, lib. ii, cap. 8).

But it is opposed to the truth, and in evident contradiction with the divine constitution of the Church to hold that

while each Bishop is *individually* bound to obey the authority of the Roman Pontiffs, taken *collectively* the Bishops are not so bound. For it is the nature and object of a foundation to support the unity of the whole edifice and to give stability to it, rather than to *each component part;* and in the present case this is much more applicable, since Christ the Lord wished that by the strength and solidity of the foundation the gates of hell should be prevented from prevailing against the Church. All are agreed that the divine promise must be understood of the Church as a whole, and not of any certain portions of it. These can, indeed, be overcome by the assaults of the powers of hell, as, in point of fact, has befallen some of them. Moreover, he who is set over the whole flock must have authority not only over the sheep dispersed throughout the Church, but also when they are assembled together. Do the sheep when they are all assembled together rule and guide the shepherd? Do the successors of the Apostles assembled together constitute the foundation on which the successor of St. Peter rests in order to derive therefrom strength and stability? Surely jurisdiction and authority belong to him in whose power have been placed the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven, not only in all provinces taken singly, but in all taken collectively. And as the Bishops, each in his own district, command with real power not only individuals but the whole community, so the Roman Pontiffs, whose jurisdiction extends to the whole Christian commonwealth, must have all its parts, even taken collectively, subject and obedient to their authority. Christ the Lord, as we have quite sufficiently shown, made Peter and his successors His *vicars*, to exercise for ever in the Church the power which He exercised during His mortal life. Can the Apostolic College be said to have been above its master in authority?

This power over the Episcopal College to which we refer, and which is clearly set forth in Holy Writ, has ever been acknowledged and attested by the Church, as is clear from the teachings of General Councils. "We read that the Roman Pontiff has pronounced judgments on the prelates of all the

churches ; we do not read that anybody has pronounced sentence on him," (Hadrianus ii, in Allocutione iii, ad Synodum Romanam an. 869, Cf. Actionem vii, Conc. Constantinopotitani iv). The reason for which is stated thus: "there is no authority greater than that of the Apostolic See," (Nicolaus in Epis. lxxxvi, ad Michael. Imperat.).[1] Wherefore Galasius on the decrees of Councils says: "That which the First See has not approved of cannot stand ; but what it has thought well to decree has been received by the whole Church," (Epist. xxvi, ad Episcopos Dardaniæ, n. 5). It has ever been unquestionably the office of the Roman Pontiffs to ratify or to reject the decrees of Councils. Leo the Great rescinded the acts of the Conciliabulum of Ephesus. Damasus rejected those of Rimini, and Hadrian I. those of Constantinople. The 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, by the very fact that it lacks the assent and approval of the Apostolic See, is admitted by all to be worthless. Rightly, therefore, has Leo X. laid down in the 5th Council of Lateran "that the Roman Pontiff alone, as having authority over all Councils, has full jurisdiction and power to summon, to transfer, to dissolve Councils, as is clear not only from the testimony of Holy Writ, from the teaching of the Fathers and of the Roman Pontiffs, and from the decrees of the sacred canons, but from the teachings of the very Councils themselves." Indeed, Holy Writ attests that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given to Peter alone, and that the power of binding and loosening was granted to the Apostles and Peter ; but there is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power *without Peter*, and *against Peter*. Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ. Wherefore, in the decree of the Vatican Council as to the nature and authority of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, no newly conceived opinion is set forth, but the venerable and constant belief of every age, (Sess. iv, cap. 3).

1 "It is evident that the judgment of the Apostolic See, than which there is no authority greater, may be rejected by no one, nor is it lawful for anyone to pass judgment on its decision."

Nor does it beget any confusion in the administration that Christians are bound to obey a two-fold authority. We are prohibited in the first place by Divine Wisdom from entertaining any such thought, since this form of government was constituted by the counsel of God Himself. In the second place we must note that the due order of things and their mutual relations are disturbed if there be a two-fold magistracy of the same rank set over a people, neither of which is amenable to the other. But the authority of the Roman Pontiff is supreme, universal, independent; that of the bishops limited and dependent. "It is not congruous that two superiors with equal authority should be placed over the same flock; but that two, one of whom is higher than the other, should be placed over the same people is not incongruous. Thus the parish priest, the bishop, and the Pope, are placed immediately over the same people," (St. Thomas in iv Sent. dist. xvii, a. 4, ad q. 4, ad 3). So the Roman Pontiffs, mindful of their duty, wish, above all things, that the Divine constitution of the Church should be preserved. Therefore, as they defend with all necessary care and vigilance their own authority, so they have always labored, and will continue to labor, that the authority of the bishops may be upheld. Yea, they look upon whatever honor or obedience is given to the bishops as paid to themselves. "My honor is the honor of the Universal Church. My honor is the strength and stability of my brethren. Then am I honored when due honor is given to everyone." (S. Gregorius M. *Epistolarum*, lib viii, ep. xxx, ad Eulogium.)

XVI.

In what has been said we have faithfully described the exemplar of Christ, the Church as divinely constituted. We have treated at length of its unity; we have explained sufficiently its nature and pointed out the way in which the Divine Founder of the Church willed that it should be preserved. There is no reason to doubt that all those, who by Divine Grace and mercy have had the happiness to have

been born, as it were, in the bosom of the Catholic Church, and to have lived in it, will listen to our Apostolic Voice: "My sheep hear my voice, (John x, 27), and they will derive from our words fuller instruction and a more perfect disposition to keep united with their respective pastors, and through them with the Supreme Pastor, so that they may remain more securely within the one fold, and may derive therefrom a greater abundance of salutary fruit. But we, who, notwithstanding our unfitness for this great dignity and office, govern by virtue of the authority conferred on us by Jesus Christ, as we "look on Jesus the author and finisher of our faith" (Heb. ii, 2) feel our heart inflamed by His charity. What Christ has said of Himself we may truly repeat of ourselves: "Other sheep I have that are not of this fold; them also I must bring and they shall hear my voice," (John x, 16). Let all those, therefore, who detest the widespread irreligion of our times, and acknowledge and confess Jesus Christ to be the Son of God and the Saviour of the human race, but who have wandered away from the Spouse, listen to our voice. Let them not refuse to obey our paternal charity. Those who acknowledge Christ must acknowledge Him wholly and entirely. "The head and the body are Christ wholly and entirely. The head is the only begotten Son of God, the body is His Church; the bridegroom and the bride, two in one flesh. All who dissent from the Scriptures concerning Christ, although they may be found in all places in which the Church is found, are not in the Church; and, again, all those who agree with the Scriptures concerning the head, and do not communicate in the unity of the Church, are not in the Church," (S. Augustinus *Contra Donatistas Epistola*, sive *De Unit. Eccl.*, cap. iv, n. 7).

And with the same yearning our soul goes out to those whom the foul breath of irreligion has not entirely corrupted, and who at least seek to have the true God, the Creator of Heaven and earth, as their Father. Let such as these take counsel with themselves, and realize that they can in no wise be counted among the children of God, unless they take Christ Jesus as their Brother, and at the same time

the Church as their Mother. We lovingly address to all the words of St. Augustine: "Let us love the Lord, our God; let us love His Church; the Lord as our Father, the Church as our Mother. Let no one say, I go, indeed, to idols, I consult fortune-tellers and soothsayers; but I leave not the Church of God; I am a Catholic. Clinging to thy Mother, thou offendest thy Father. Another, too, says: 'Far be it from me; I do not consult fortune-telling, I seek not soothsaying, I seek not profane divinations, I go not to the worship of devils, I serve not stones; but I am on the side of Donatus.' What doth it profit thee not to offend the Father, who avenges an offence against the Mother? What doth it profit to confess the Lord, to honor God, to preach Him, to acknowledge His Son, and to confess that He sits on the right hand of the Father, If you blaspheme His Church? . . . If you had a beneficent friend, whom you honored daily —and even once calumniated his spouse, would you ever enter his house? Hold fast, therefore, O dearly beloved, hold fast altogether God as your Father, and the Church as your Mother," (Enarratio in Psal. lxxxviii., sermo ii., n. 13).

Above all things, trusting in the mercy of God who is able to move the hearts of men and to incline them as and when He pleases, we must earnestly commend to His loving kindness all those of whom we have spoken. As a pledge of Divine grace, and as a token of our affection, we lovingly impart to you, in the Lord, Venerable Brethren, to your clergy and people, our Apostolic Blessing.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, the 29th day of June, in the year 1896, and the nineteenth of our Pontificate.

LEO XIII., POPE.

THE SEPTUAGINT.

THE Sacred Writings of the Old Testament have been transmitted to us not only in the Original Hebrew, but also in other languages into which they were at several times translated. Foremost among these various translations, ranks the old Greek Version of the Hebrew Bible, known as "*the Septuagint.*"

It was the first translation of Holy Scripture to come into existence, and long before the Christian era, it was substituted in the place of the Original Hebrew in the public services of the Greek-speaking Jews dispersed throughout the world. It contributed powerfully to spread among the Gentiles the expectation of the coming Messias, and to introduce into the Greek language such theological words and ideas as would make of it a more fitting instrument for the diffusion of the Gospel. Even in Palestine at the time of Our Lord, the Jewish Rabbis recognized as legitimate the use of this Greek translation, and the Jewish priest and historian Josephus used it freely in his writings.

All this, however, was but the prelude of the wide influence and great authority which were to be acquired by the Septuagint in the Christian Church. To it, and not to the Hebrew Text, must be directly referred almost all the citations of the Old Testament which we notice in the Inspired Writings of the New. All the Fathers of the primitive Church depended entirely on it for the knowledge they obtained and for the use they made of the Scriptures of the Old Covenant. Even when Latin translations appear, they are made *directly* and *literally* from the Septuagint Version. Indeed, it may be said that up to the middle of the sixth century of our era, when the Latin translation which St. Jerome had made directly from the Original Hebrew was everywhere adopted in the Western Churches, the Septuagint remained *practically*—either *immediately* or *mediately* through the old Latin Versions,—the translation of the Old

Testament universally received in the Christian Church. So widespread in fact was its authority and so great the reverence shown it during that lengthy period, that many Fathers, among whom are reckoned St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Augustine, did not hesitate to ascribe to the Greek translators the positive help of *Divine Inspiration.*

These are most important facts, and they enable us to understand why this Greek Version has remained down to the present day in the Christian Church, the Standard Text of the Old Testament entirely substituted in place of the Original Hebrew; why, when selecting the Latin Vulgate as the Official Text of the Latin Church, the Council of Trent explicitly recognized the full authority of the Septuagint; and why, in compliance with the wishes of many of the Fathers of Trent, Pope Sixtus V published an Authentic edition of this same Greek Version.

It must, therefore, be admitted that of all the ancient translations of Holy Writ, none ranks higher than the Septuagint, not only as regards its antiquity, but also as to its influence and authority. And yet, strange to say, none exhibits such striking differences from the Original Text in the form in which it has come down to us. These differences are both very numerous and very extensive, as was remarked long centuries ago by several Fathers of the Church, notably by Origen and St. Jerome. Nor has their importance been less keenly felt by contemporary Biblical scholars, if we may judge by the amount of time and labor which they have devoted to determine the exact nature of these differences and to account for their origin. In view of this twofold problem, the history of the Septuagint and its distinct features have been scrutinized in our day with a thoroughness unequalled since the days of Origen; and it is of the main results of this close and patient investigation, that we wish to give a brief account in the following pages.

I.

The earliest document connected with the history of the Septuagint Version is the legend which recounts the manner

in which the translation of the Pentateuch originated. The King of Egypt, Ptolemy Philadelphus (B. C. 285–247), we are told, had recently established a library in Alexandria, his capital, and at the suggestion of his head librarian, Demetrius Phalereus, he determined to enrich it with a copy in Greek of the Sacred Writings of the Jews. Thereupon, he was advised by one of his distinguished officers, Aristeas by name, to set free the thousands of Jewish slaves who were in the various parts of the kingdom, in order that he might thereby secure the good will and help of the Jewish authorities at Jerusalem to carry out his design. This he did with royal liberality; and a long procession of these freed men started for the Holy City, bearing with them most costly presents for the Temple, together with a letter from the King, requesting Eleazar, the high priest, to send a copy of the Law, and Jewish scholars capable of translating it.

In compliance with the request, Eleazar sends down to Egypt fine parchment manuscripts of the Pentateuch written in golden letters, and six learned men out of each tribe, seventy-two in all,[1] to carry out the great work of the translation. During seven days, the interpreters have audiences of the King and excite the admiration of all by the wisdom with which they answer seventy-two questions, after which lodgings are assigned to them in the island of Pharos, away from the bustle of the capital. There, they complete their work in seventy-two days, and it obtains the formal approval of the Jews of Alexandria. Finally King Ptolemy receives the translation of the Law with great reverence, and sends the interpreters home, laden with rich gifts for themselves and for the high priest.

Such is the substance of a legend which has come down to us under the cover of a letter addressed by the above named Aristeas to his brother Philocrates. Many of its particulars are evidently fantastic, and the glowing tribute of admiration which it pays to the Temple of Jerusalem, to the Country of

1 It is most likely from this number, *seventy-two*, that the Version received the name of *the Septuagint*, which is a round figure for seventy two, and is usually denoted by the Latin numerals lxx.

the Jews, to their wise and holy Laws, in a word to everything Jewish, points to a pious Jew, not to the pagan officer Aristeas, as its author. Nevertheless, the Letter of Aristeas was accepted without misgivings by Josephus, by the famous Alexandrian Jew, Philo, by many early Fathers of the Church, notably by St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and indeed by all ecclesiastical writers down to the beginning of the sixteenth century when its authority was first questioned by Louis Vives, a distinguished professor of Louvain. Nay more, as time went on, the marvellous details of the legend were improved upon; the seventy-two interpreters were transformed into inspired writers who worked independently of each other, and yet produced translations which upon examination proved to be word for word identical; they were moreover made to render into Greek not only the Pentateuch, but also all the other books of the Hebrew Bible.

At the present day, all Biblical scholars reject these fabulous additions to the primitive legend, and consider the very letter of Aristeas as spurious. Many among them go even much farther. They look upon the whole story as a pure romance invented to add to the authority of the oldest Greek Version of the Jewish Law. They refuse to believe that the translation which abounds in expressions unintelligible to Greeks could have been made for them as represented in the legend. They point out how unlikely it is that the Jews of Alexandria should have adopted for their public services, a translation of their Holy Law made at the request of a pagan prince. Again, they tell us that the appearance of this Greek Version in Egypt, about the middle of the third century before Christ, can easily be accounted for otherwise than by appealing to the desire of a pagan king to enrich his library with a Greek translation of the Sacred Writings of the Jews. We have only to suppose that the Jews, so numerous in Egypt, having gradually ceased to be familiar with the Hebrew Language, had first the law interpreted orally in Greek in their synagogues, and that this interpretation was after a while, for practical purposes, committed to

writing. Finally, they appeal to the features of the work itself. On the one hand, it betrays an imperfect knowledge of Hebrew and contains mistakes about names of places in Palestine; and on the other hand, it is filled with Egyptian words and expressions, with Greek forms which prevailed at Alexandria, and with free renderings in striking contrast with the superstitious literalism of the Jewish schools. All these characteristics of the Greek Version of the Pentateuch make it indeed evident that it originated in Alexandria, as is affirmed by the legend; but, they point to Greek speaking Jews of that same city as the translators, rather than to Jewish scholars of Jerusalem sent by the high priest, as the letter of Aristeas would have us believe.

In view of these weighty arguments against the historical character of the very core of the legend, it is easy to understand how a recent writer in the *Dublin Review* (July, 1895, p. 44) could speak as follows: "The legend on the whole appears to deserve no credit, except in so far as it assigns the translation[1] to the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus who perhaps might have shown some interest in the work."

Indeed, even this much could hardly be inferred with certainty from the sole letter of Aristeas which is not only spurious, but was manifestly written, as we perceive by its contents, for the purpose of increasing the authority of the Greek Version of the Jewish Law. However this may be, it must be said that from other considerations—especially from the study of the features of the translation,—contemporary scholars conclude that the translation of the Pentateuch was made in Alexandria by Egyptian Jews about the middle of the third century before Christ, and that it formed the first instalment of the Greek Version of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint.

The other books of the Hebrew Bible were subsequently translated; some probably—the Psalms for instance,—for liturgical purposes; others, as may be inferred from the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, with a view to spread their doctrinal and ethical teachings. Whether they were rendered

1 Of the Law.

into Greek soon after the translation of the Pentateuch had appeared, cannot be determined with certainty. In fact, all that we really know about this point is that, at the time when the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus was written (about B. C. 130), almost all these Books had been already translated for some time. Nor have we more definite information about the place where the translation was made, for the only historical aid concerning it, is furnished by the conclusion of the Book of Esther (chap. xi, 1), in which we are told that this Book "was interpreted in *Jerusalem.*" History is likewise silent in regard to the *number* and *qualifications* of the translators. It is universally admitted, however, that the variations noticeable in the renderings of identical expressions and of parallel passages repeated in several of these Books, point to several translators, and that the difference in merit of the various portions of the translation proves that the interpreters were men of very different attainments in literary skill and in Hebrew scholarship.

The same lack of positive information extends to another point of greater importance in the history of the translation of the Inspired Books distinct from the Pentateuch. We refer to the numerous differences existing between our present Hebrew Text and the Hebrew copies used by the Greek translators. According to many writers of the last centuries, and even according to a few contemporary scholars, these variations are to be accounted for by the Egyptian origin of the manuscripts rendered into Greek. Whilst our Hebrew Text would go back to official transcripts made in Palestine, the Septuagint Version should be traced back to Hebrew copies transmitted and multiplied far away from the control of the Jewish authorities at Jerusalem, and by scholars who were less learned and less careful than the scribes of Palestine. In consequence, we are told, we should look upon the Septuagint simply as representing a corrupted form of the Original Hebrew, the various readings of which practically deserve no attention.

At the present day, this theory is generally regarded as an *a priori* assumption intended to uphold the supreme

authority of the Hebrew Bible, and it is certainly disproved by many conclusive arguments.

It is clear, first of all, that despite this theory, all the departures from the Original Hebrew which are noticed in the Septuagint Version, are not corruptions of primitive readings preserved to us in our Hebrew Bible; for it is beyond doubt that many of these variations point to readings preferable to the corresponding ones in our present Hebrew Text. Again, the Books of the Hebrew Bible distinct from the Pentateuch were rendered into Greek under the Ptolemies (about 270—110 B. C.), that is at a time when the Jews were very numerous in Egypt and were so wealthy that they could make frequent pilgrimages to Jerusalem and offer rich gifts to its Temple. It is then highly improbable that they would have accepted for their public services a translation very inferior to a Palestinian Standard of the Sacred Text, or that they would have found it impossible to procure manuscripts of an approved and official character if such were in existence. Besides, it is not likely that such an objectionable Version as that which is supposed by the theory under consideration, would have been tolerated, still less positively approved—as Jewish tradition affirms,—by the Rabbis of Jerusalem for the use of the Greek-speaking Jews who were habitual residents in the Holy City. Nor can we readily believe that a Version of that description would have been freely used by the Jewish priest and Pharisee Josephus, and by the Inspired Writers of the New Testament. Finally, a convincing proof that when the Septuagint Version was made, there was really no official Text current in Palestine, is found in the fact that when such a Text was promulgated, viz.: towards the end of the first century of our era, the old Greek Version soon lost its credit with the Jewish Rabbis.[1]

1 In the present essay we do not intend to examine the origin of the additional Books or parts of Books which are called *Deutero-Canonical*, and which though fonnd only in the Septuagint Version are not properly deviations from the Original Hebrew. The developments which would be entailed by an examination of this topic must be postponed to some future time.

It must be said, however, that what contributed most to induce the Jews to reject the authority of the Septuagint, is the difficulty they found in meeting the arguments which the early Christians drew from this old Greek Version. At the beginning of the second century, the Christians, mostly converts from paganism, naturally appealed to the Septuagint in their controversies with the Jews, and pointed out in it remarkable prophecies fulfilled in Our Lord. Worsted by arguments derived from a Version hitherto accepted by them, the Jews began to dislike it and to deny that it agreed with the Original Hebrew. The controversy thus started about the relation existing between the Septuagint and the Hebrew Text, led to a twofold result. On the one hand, the Jews welcomed heartily a new Greek translation made most literally from the Hebrew by the Jewish proselyte Aquila who flourished about 130 A. D. On the other hand, the Christians, feeling keenly the need of bringing their Greek copies into greater harmony with the Hebrew Text, began to make in them additions, suppressions, etc., which of course varied in extent and character with almost each transcriber.

If we join to these intentional alterations of the copies of the Septuagint, the accidental variations necessarily entailed by repeated transcription, we shall easily understand the loud complaints of Origen about the numerous differences he noticed in the Greek manuscripts of his time, and also his great efforts to establish a more reliable recension by making a thorough revision of the Septuagint translation. Accordingly, he compared the Greek manuscripts with the Hebrew text, supplying from the original Hebrew what seemed to be omissions, and noting what seemed to him mistakes or additions. These additions, omissions, etc., he denoted by asterisks, crosses and other literary marks. But, as might naturally be expected, these marks soon got misplaced and often came to be omitted altogether, so that, in course of time, the cure became really worse than the disease.

Later on, two other important revisions of the Septuagint were made, the one by a priest of Antioch, Lucian ; and the

other, by the Egyptian bishop and martyr Hesychius; but as they have been but imperfectly recovered, it is impossible at the present day, to define what relation they bore to each other and to the primitive text of the Septuagint Version.

Notwithstanding these fruitful causes of corruption so long at work upon the Septuagint, contemporary scholars think that in the *Vatican* manuscript—so-called from the place where it is preserved—we have a copy dating from the fourth century, which very fairly represents the Septuagint translation in its primitive form. For, upon comparison with another manuscript a little later in date, the *Alexandrine* now found in the British Museum, the Vatican Codex proves to be free from the additions which were made by the early Christians to the Greek copies, and which abound in the Alexandrine manuscript.

From this rapid sketch of the history of the Septuagint Version and of the critical examination to which it has been subjected of late, it follows, that this Greek translation of the Original Hebrew has a real right to be made use of for the improvement of our present Hebrew Text. Not only is it older than any extant Hebrew copies, but we have every reason to think that it was made from transcripts of the Original Documents of at least equal value with those from which our Hebrew Text was formed, and that it has come down to us in a fair state of preservation.

We now proceed to point out the principal literary and textual features of this venerable Version, and to state the main conclusions which they have suggested to modern Biblical scholars.

II.

One of the most remarkable features exhibited by the Septuagint Version, is connected with the Greek language in which it is written. In vain would we look for the pure Attic dialect of such prose writers as Xenophon, Demosthenes, Plato and Aristotle; for, long before the Septuagint translation was even begun, this Attic dialect had gradually undergone important changes. As a result of the extensive

conquests of the Macedonians who had adopted it as the language of their court, it had ceased to be the particular language of Attica, and had become the universal or "common" language used by prose writers and by educated classes in all the Greek-speaking States. But, as a necessary consequence of this wider diffusion, it had soon lost much of its primitive purity and elegance.

To this first cause of change was added another which brought about a still greater decadence in the Attic dialect. When Alexandria, Antioch and other great cities were founded in the East by Alexander the Great and his successors, Greeks of divers tribes and dialects flocked to these new centres of commerce, and from their free intercourse soon resulted a popular form of language which was, to some extent, peculiar to each of these cities, and, which in all cases, deviated much more from Attic purity than did the language used by men of culture. The Jewish interpreters in particular—as, indeed, those for whom they wrote—had learned Greek much less from books than from oral intercourse with the mixed population of Egypt and Syria; so that, even in writing, they naturally retained almost all the peculiarities of the popular idiom. This is why, throughout the various portions of this Version, Biblical scholars have been able to point out many departures not only from Attic purity and elegance, but even from the literary style of the good authors of the same period, to notice forms which were current chiefly in Alexandria, and to trace back to the primitive Greek dialects a large number of words and expressions.

But the Septuagint translators had not only an imperfect knowledge of Greek, they also lacked a real command of Hebrew. The sacred Tongue was either dead or dying, and all their knowledge of it was acquired by oral teaching, by habitual reading of the Original Text, and by speaking, though in a corrupt form, Hebrew among themselves. In the complete absence of grammars and dictionaries, they had to fall back upon tradition in regard to the interpretation of difficult passages, when, indeed, such interpre-

tation had been handed down by tradition. Thus were they greatly hampered in their work, being obliged to deal with two languages, neither of which they had really mastered, and whose grammar, syntax and genius are so different from each other. No wonder, then, that their Greek, already far from classical, should furthermore be marred—as it is in reality—by Hebrew idioms, translated word for word, and that we should even at times notice Hebrew words simply transcribed in Greek letters ;[1] for they were unable to give their exact meaning. Of course, in all such cases, the manner in which the Jewish interpreters dealt with the Text, is objectionable from a literary standpoint. But, as recent scholars have justly remarked, it has the great advantage of proving the general faithfulness of the translators, and of enabling us to determine with certainty the exact reading which was found in their Hebrew manuscripts.

It is plain, moreover, that they resorted to such methods of literal translation only in places where they were not able to furnish the reader with something more satisfactory ; for their constant aim was to convey with great distinctness what they considered to be the exact meaning of the Original. For this laudable purpose, they repeatedly changed the pronoun which represented the subject or object of a sentence into the name of the person or thing alluded to; thus, instead of "*he*" or "*him*" in the Original, we find "*David*" or "*Solomon*," etc., in the Greek translation. Again, they did not scruple to add a word or two to render clearer the meaning of an obscure sentence, or to supply what appeared to be an ellipsis in the Hebrew Text. Changes of the kind were manifestly calculated to enhance the literary merit of the translation, and they do not offer much difficulty to modern Biblical scholars, who, in their efforts to improve our present Hebrew Text, can easily take them into account when they compare the Septuagint Version with the Original Hebrew.

1 Here are a few instances: Gen. xxviii, 19 ואולם לוז καὶ Οὐλαμμυς ; Jos. vii, 24 עמקעכר Ἐμεκαχωρ ; Judges iv, 26 כיעז Μαουεκ ; IV Kings (heb. II Kings) iii, 4 נכ Νωκηβ ; etc., etc.

At other times, exegetical considerations have had great weight with the Greek interpreters, and have led them to handle the Text with a freedom which we would hardly consider allowable now-a-days to translators of the Sacred Text. Not only did they suppress the ancient proper name of the God of Israel which we are accustomed to write as *Jehovah*, and substitute in its place the word (the Lord),[1] but they sedulously changed expressions which they thought could be misunderstood or used to establish some false doctrine. Thus in the Hebrew Text of Exodus xxiv, 10, we read that the ancients of Israel who went up towards Mount Sinai with Moses "*saw the God of Israel.*" This expression, it was thought, could not be rendered literally without suggesting that the Spiritual God can be seen by the bodily eyes of men, and without offering an apparent contradiction to Exodus xxxiii, 20: "NO *man shall* SEE ME *and* LIVE." In consequence the translators changed it, and said: "THEY SAW *the* PLACE WHERE THE GOD OF ISRAEL HAD STOOD." In like manner, the Hebrew phrase, "*to see the* FORM *of Jehovah*," becomes in the same Version: "*to see the glory of God*" (Numb. xii, 8; Ps. xvii, in Greek, Ps. xvi, 15). Other similar anthropomorphisms were so modified as to remove much of their objectionable character; as for instance, when the Hebrew expressions in Genesis xvi, 6: "It *repented* Jehovah that He had made man on the earth, and it *grieved* Him at *His heart*, and said . . . ." are changed into: "God *thought* that He had made man on the earth, and He *reflected*, and said . . . ." Obviously, in these and other such cases, the primitive reading is that of the Hebrew Text.

Such then are the principal literary features exhibited by the Septuagint Version. They appear in all its books, although, as might naturally be expected, their character varies considerably in its several parts. Thus, for instance,

1 This change was effected under the influence of the superstitious reverence of the Hebrew-speaking Jews who, in reading or even transcribing the Sacred Text, substituted *Adonai* (the Lord) or in certain cases *Elohim* (God) in place of the most sacred Name, the true pronunciation of which is not *Jehovah* but *Jahwè*.

the Pentateuch is by far the best rendered in respect of closeness, care and elegance; on the contrary, the translation of Isaias is poor and paraphrastic; the translation of Job and Proverbs bespeaks a fair knowledge of Hebrew, together with a comparatively free handling of the Text, whilst that of Ezechiel, Paralipomenon, Canticle of Canticles and Ecclesiastes is very literal.

It is plain, therefore, that the oldest Greek Version of the Hebrew Bible bears in its style the impress of the various circumstances of time and place in the midst of which it was made, and of the exegetical views of the translators. Nor is it less certain that these literary features must not be lost sight of, whenever we wish to utilize the Septuagint for the improvement of our present Hebrew Text, although they cannot in any way compare in importance with the Textual features which we have now to point out.

III.

Of all the Textual features connected with the Septuagint Version, the most important and the best known, is that the the Greek translation contains no less than *seven* books which are not found in the Hebrew Bible, and yet are recognized by the Church as Canonical and Inspired. If, indeed, like *two* of them, viz: *Wisdom* and II *Machabees*, they had *all* been originally written in Greek, we might perhaps appeal to a difference of language to explain their absence from a collection of Inspired Books written in Hebrew. But as a matter of fact, *five* of these books, viz: *Tobias*, *Judith*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Baruch* and *I Machabees* were originally written in Hebrew. Furthermore, these seven books were found in the Septuagint Version before the Christian era, and were all so placed among the other books of Holy Writ in this same Version, as to imply no difference of authority between them and the other Books. As a consequence, Biblical scholars are confronted with the following dilemma: If the Hebrew Bible never contained these seven books, how can their presence be accounted for in the Septuagint? If, on the other hand, the Hebrew Bible contained them at any

time, why are they no longer there? An answer to this riddle appears still more difficult, when we bear in mind that the book known in the Septuagint Version as the *first Book of Esdras*, and to all appearances enjoying in it the same authority as any other Book of Holy Writ, was ultimately excluded by the Church from the number of the Inspired Books, after having been long considered as Divine Scripture by several fathers and ecclesiastical writers. But this most important question would manifestly require a separate treatment. We, therefore, confine ourselves in the present paper to point it out and to recommend it to the reflection of the reader.

As to the Books which are found both in the Septuagint and in the Hebrew Bible, they present Textual differences which, although far less important than the one just described, yet have no small significance because either of their number or of their character.

I.—The Pentateuch is certainly the portion of Holy Writ in which these Textual differences are least considerable. And yet, even in the Pentateuch, especially in the Book of Exodus, Biblical scholars have pointed out several important variations from the Hebrew Text, in the form of additions, omissions, inversions, etc. (cfr. Numb. iv, 14; x, 6; Exod. xii, 10; xxviii, 23–28; xxxv, 13–18, etc.). They have moreover noticed that throughout the Pentateuch the Septuagint presents numberless differences of detail, the significance of which has appeared the greater in their eyes, because in more than a thousand of these passages the Greek Version agrees with the Samaritan Pentateuch, a form of the Hebrew Text, which goes back at least to the fifth century before our era. And as they have no ground for affirming that either the Septuagint or the Samaritan Pentateuch were influenced by each other, they are led to suppose that in such passages both represent the primitive Hebrew reading, whilst the Massoretic Text has been corrupted.

II.—Many of the variations noticeable in the Books of Kings are far more extensive. Thus, in III Kings, we remark after the first verse of chap. iii an addition of 19 lines; verse

46 in the same chapter has been increased by an addition of 19 lines also; and in chap. xii so much has been added to verse 24 that in the Septuagint it has no less than 68 lines, instead of the two or three it should naturally have if it were a simple translation of the present Hebrew Text. And let the reader bear in mind that these are not short lines, for they are found in the folio edition of Sixtus V, published in 1587.

Several omissions are on the same extensive scale as the additions just spoken of. Thus, in the narrative of David and Goliath, in chap. xvii of the first Book of Kings, the Septuagint omits the verses 12–31, 41, 50, 55–58; again, in III Kings, chap. ix, verses 15–25, recording Solomon's dealings with Pharoah, with the remnant of the Chanaanite population and with his own subjects, are entirely omitted; in chap. xiv of the same book, the first twenty verses containing the prediction of the fate of the family of Jeroboam are likewise omitted, etc.

Transpositions of long passages are also to be found in the Septuagint Version; as, for instance, in III Kings, where the first twelve verses of chap. vii are placed after verse 51 of the same chapter, and where chap. xxi occurs before chap. xx.

In view of differences so extensive, and of numerous minor variations of a similar kind noticeable throughout the Books of Kings, it is easy to understand how recent Biblical scholars have been led to admit that the translators made use of a Hebrew Text very different from the one which we have at present. This opinion is all the more probable, because a careful study of these variations proves that the Septuagint is very often the better of the two.

III.—The Prophetical writings abound likewise in important textual differences. This is especially true of Ezechiel, and more particularly still of Jeremias.[1] In the last named

1 We do not intend to dwell here on the textual features of the Book of *Daniel*, the Septuagint translation of which differs very much from the Hebrew Text, and was supplanted in the Church by that of Theodotion, as early as the second part of the second century.

prophet, the oracles "AGAINST THE NATIONS" contained in chap. xlvi-li in the Hebrew, are inserted—and in different order,—immediately after chapt. xxiv, 13 in the Septuagint. Which of the two arrangements is preferable is a debated question among Biblical Scholars. But, according to most of them, this very difference clearly proves that, in the Hebrew manuscripts of the Greek translators, these long chapters were already in a place different from that which they now hold in the Hebrew Bible.

Besides these transpositions, we find important omissions (chapt. xvii, 1-4; xxvii, a great part of verses 5-22; xxix, 16-20; xxxiii, 14-26; xxxix, 4-13); and in connection with many of them, it is impossible not to recognize the superiority of the Septuagint over the present Hebrew Text. Indeed a detailed examination of them has led most scholars to admit that, what circulated under the name of Jeremias must have been, at the time, a book very different from ours.

IV.—The textual differences exhibited by the Book of Jeremias have more than their counterpart, in at least one of the poetical works of the Bible, viz.: the Book of Proverbs. In the Septuagint, we find notable transpositions, numerous additions throughout the Book, and also important omissions;[1] and it is beyond doubt, that in a great many cases, the Greek Version happily completes or corrects the Hebrew Text. Nor is it less certain that, as Fr. Vigouroux says: "most of the variations are derived from a different Hebrew Original" (cfr. Manuel Biblique, ii, No. 822, 2°).

In the Book of *Job*, we find most important omissions. Unfortunately, even in the Vatican manuscript, the Septuagint translation of this Book has been much tampered with, so that it has long been difficult to realize their number and character. Within the last few years, however, copies of the Book of Job in an Egyptian translation, called the *Sahidic*, have been discovered, and have allowed some Biblical scholars to reach conclusions which they consider definite about these omissions; for, both intrinsic and

1 All these variations are carefully pointed out by Fr. Vigouroux, Manuel Biblique, ii, No. 822, *foot-note*.

extrinsic reasons tend to prove that the Egyptian translation was made directly from the Septuagint, when this Greek Version was still in its primitive form. Now, in these copies, the omissions amount to about 376 verses; so that the whole Book, as it probably stood originally in the Septuagint, was about one sixth shorter than our Hebrew Bible.

It is not necessary that we should pursue further the description of the features exhibited by the oldest Greek Version of the Hebrew Bible. The facts to which we have called attention are more than sufficient to vindicate the general position assumed by most recent Biblical scholars, Catholic and Protestant alike. Even admitting that a large number of minor variations are due to mistakes on the part of the Septuagint interpreters, to a freedom of translation which amounts to paraphrase, etc., it is evident that the numerous and larger variations we have pointed out, lead to the conclusion that the Hebrew Text which lay before the Greek translators, differed very considerably from the Hebrew Text in the form in which it has come down to us. They clearly point also to the second century before Christ, as to a time when the Hebrew Text existed in a variety of forms, one of which is represented by the Septuagint, and another, by the manuscripts from which the Massoretic Text is derived. Nay more, even our rapid summary of the conclusions reached by scholars who have examined closely these variations, brings out the fact that, in a large number of cases, the Greek Version is superior to the Hebrew Bible.

It is clear, therefore, that the position of most of the early Reformers who believed in the perfect integrity of the Hebrew Text and rejected all that was not in accordance with it, was not only gratuitous, but positively contrary to facts. We see likewise, how much wiser and more conformable to true science, was the position assumed by the Fathers of Trent who, guided by the tradition of Christian ages, were not so carried away by their love for the Latin

Vulgate, as not to recognize most explicitly the authority of the Septuagint translation. We see, finally, how truly wonderful was the clear sightedness of Pope Sixtus V, who, before publishing an official edition of the Vulgate, caused an Authentic edition of the Greek Version to be made, in order that it might be used as a basis and guide in preparing the contemplated Authentic edition of the Latin Vulgate.

F. E. GIGOT, S.S.

St. John's Seminary, Boston.

THE UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF ARCHBISHOP SEGHERS.

Continued.[1]

AT the age of twenty-five, Father Seghers found himself administrator of the missionary diocese and at this early date gave ample proof of the capacities that made him so useful for the Church in the far West. During his first administration he sent the following letter to the Rector:

"I read with the greatest pleasure, I should say with a heart overflowing with joy, your kind letter to me and also the one directed to the Bishop. His Lordship, who is at present in California for the sake of his health, ordered me to open, read and answer all his letters during his absence.

"My first duty is to thank you for the fatherly admonitions you have sent me. You scarcely realize how welcome and beneficial such advices are to me. I wish you would never let any opportunity pass without addressing some of those encouraging words to me. They show that I have still a place in your heart. If you knew what deep and lasting impression they make upon me, you would never neglect to favor me with seasonable directions.

"The Irish subdeacon who arrived last July from All Hallows, has been successively ordained deacon and priest by our Bishop, and he is now my

1 See AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, July, 1896, p. 21.

assistant at the church in Victoria. We do the work together as equals. He will likely make occasional missionary trips to Nanaimo and Sooke. I have the charge of the convent: a new chain binding me to Victoria, leaving me no prospects of missionary excursions among the Indians. The will of the Lord be done! I obeyed my Bishop with reluctance, but I obeyed, after all, because I am satisfied that his will and God's will are but one will.

"I have to direct the spiritual and temporal affairs of the Sisters, also their pupils in their studies and watch over the discipline. What an amount of work!—My new position, viewed in a spiritual light, is not without dangers, and I hope it will move you to pray for me and to get other good souls to pray for me. I felt much afraid at first, but now I rely on God, and after a few months I hope to feel at ease in my new charge.

"You are anxious, no doubt, to know what is the matter with the Bishop. Some time ago he made up his mind to go to South America to collect for the building of a cathedral. The only thing which prevented him from starting sooner was the required permission from Rome. A few weeks ago leave of absence came and his journey was determined upon. But on a Saturday morning as the Bishop was at the altar we suddenly felt a severe shock of earthquake. The Bishop was so frightened that he got a slight stroke of paralysis which benumbed the left side of his body. A milder climate could not but benefit his health. He consequently resolved to spend a few weeks in southern California with the intention of setting out for his collecting-tour as soon as he would feel better. His sickness, then, has hastened his departure and directed him first to California where, in the hands of an experienced physician, he expects a prompt recovery in the warm valleys of Santa Clara and Santa Barbara.

"Our Rev. Maloney, whom I love as my brother, shows the best dispositions. Thanks be to God! God bless him, says the Irishman."

The Rector had written to the Bishop; offering the services of two priests from the diocese of Liège. Father Seghers says that the matter concerns the Bishop, and continues:

"However, I take the liberty to tell you that it is regular nonsense for those men to come out to these countries, even to work among the Indians, without being duly posted up in English. We have a good French priest here whose knowledge of English enables him to say: 'no good,' 'I no know.' And he is really 'no good' for our work, except to sing Mass on Sunday. Even at our convent where most of the Sisters are Canadians, English is necessary for Sisters and pupils and therefore the old Oblate Father had to give up the direction and the Bishop was obliged to appoint me, surely a director two hundred times less learned and less experienced.

"As for other qualities, if priests can control their own selves, and if they can be submissive and obey, they will get along here.

"Your next letter, dear Rev. Father, will, I hope, contain some directions for me in my new position. I want light. '*Si caecus caeco ducatum praestet* . . .

"Several weeks ago Dr. d'Herbomez, Vicar Apostolic of British Columbia, was consecrated Bishop of Miletopolis i. p. i. The ceremony took place in our church and attracted a large crowd of Catholics, Protestants, Jews and Indians. It will certainly be remembered and spoken of for years. It was a well conducted ceremony. The Archbishop of Oregon was the consecrator. His brother, Bishop Blanchet, was prevented from attending by a sad affair which must cause him a great deal of sorrow. One of the Sisters left the convent and returned to her native city, New York. The only reason why she quitted the religious habit was that she had no vocation, as she thought. And, indeed, she may be right; for she turned Catholic when but sixteen years of age and then entered the convent in the first fervor of conversion. She first got acquainted with the roses of convent life and afterwards may have felt the pricking of its thorns. However simple and even natural this affair may be, Protestants will have another chance to talk about 'nuns imprisoned in convents,' 'kept inside against their will by unmerciful priests' . . . "

He then tells about the failure of some mines, especially the Carriboo mines; and predicts poverty and misery for the winter. People are leaving the country and the prosperity of the Island seems to be on the decline, but "Victoria will always remain a frequented seaport of the Northern Pacific, since the mouths of the Columbia and the Frazer are utterly treacherous. Last year the 'Tribune,' an English man-of-war, sailed up the Frazer River and got stuck in the sand banks. The shifting sands damaged her a great deal and she had difficulty to move out of it. One of our papers in Victoria proposed a scheme to dam the channel of the Frazer. A sailor on board the 'Tribune' remarked: 'What is the use? We have been damning the river for several days, and things did not get a bit better for it.'"

"Yesterday was the festival of Christmas. Our midnight Mass was a regular triumph. The church was beautifully decorated and illuminated. Father Malone preached an excellent sermon, and our choir sang Mozart's Twelfth Mass The music was really fine In spite of the heavy storm the church was so crowded that a good many persons had to return home, as they could not remain standing outside of the church on account of the rain. Among the thirteen singers was a lady who sang the soprano part and whose supple and powerful voice has been the object of admiration in all the principal churches and concert halls of the States. Our singing was

acknowledged to be the very best in the whole town. Nevertheless, all this is not what we call 'doing good.' I feel sorry when I see people come to church to listen to the music and to remain as cold as the icicles that are hanging from our roofs. The prayers of good souls in the old country are necessary for the improvement of our wicked Victoria. Music and all the rest is not a bit better than a mere *humbug*.

"The school of the Oblate Fathers has about one hundred boys. These Fathers have just completed a church for the French population. I may be allowed to say with St. Augustin that if they can convert these Frenchmen without miracles, it surely will be the greatest of all miracles! I am afraid, however, the Oblates will soon leave us, and their college will be thrown on our shoulders. Oh! if we had only more priests!"

On Ascension Day, 1865, he finds a few minutes spare time to write to the Rector and to thank him for sending him the "Mystery" of the Living Rosary, established in the College for students and priests on the mission, and to assure him that he "never forgets his fellow-members of the Living Rosary, neither at Mass nor in his Office."

"The work pressing now on my shoulders is sufficient to keep me busy for three months; and yet it increases every day. Our Bishop is still in California, but he will return to Victoria within four weeks. He had made up his mind to go to South America to collect money, but as his presence is badly needed here to settle important matters (difficulties with the Oblate Fathers), I begged of him to come to Victoria as soon as possible, which he promised to do. I hope to be able to send you good news about this affair in my next letter. But in the meanwhile, I entreat you to secure the prayers of good people for our Diocese. Although much good has been done, yet a great deal remains to be done, and great, exceedingly great, obstacles have to be cleared away before we can lay any solid foundations.

"We have no hospital. Last year I submitted to the Bishop and a few prominent members of the congregation a plan, and stated the reasons why we should have a hospital in Victoria in charge of Sisters of Mercy. My plan was adopted with great enthusiasm. The whole population grew in favor of it, and all, Jews and Protestants, as well as Catholics, contributed generously towards the proposed institution. But the money crisis came and stopped the execution of our propositions. Now times are so dull and money is so scarce that we must wait for better days. Resignation and prayer are all which we have to resort to at present. I am still at Victoria, Pastor of the church (Cathedral), director of the convent and school, and for the last six months I am doing the Bishop's business. If I am not mistaken, after a few months I shall have more work than ever. Healthy and strong, I shall always feel contented with what happens."

The venerable Rector sends wise counsels and practical directions for the young spiritual director of nuns and administrator of the diocese, and Father Seghers gratefully acknowledges them and confesses that he often felt uneasy when he considered his youth and the charges laid on him. "Confidence in God has been the only thing that could enable me to obey my Bishop." He praises the "good spirit with which the American College is fostered."

"I shall feel grateful to God all my life for having brought me to America through the American College of Louvain. The Bishop arrived last Saturday from California, greatly improved in health. He will probably leave for South America in the fall to collect money.

"My health is very good, though sometimes I feel weary and tired. But I am going backwards in the path of virtue. Good heavens! I never thought that preaching to others does more harm than good to the preacher. Now, I am sure that it is so. It is now two years since I made a retreat; I feel an awful need of spiritual exercises. I hardly dare ask the Bishop to grant me a few days of rest to think of my soul. You must notice in my letter something like levity. Well, it is a faithful picture of my spiritual condition, and it shows you how much I need the help of your prayers."

He is delighted to learn of improvemements made at the college, and requests the Rector to induce his Flemish uncle to send him "money, music, and nice pictures."

More words of comfort and encouragement from his "Alma Mater" reach the zealous missionary in the midst of heavy work, and he promises to "keep them forever in his heart."

"To tell you how pleased I was, dear Father, in reading your letter is impossible. The pious language you have used has made a deep impression on me. It is strange, we work for the salvation of others; we prepare sermons for the salvation of others, we preach and apply to them the truths of our holy religion, and we forget and neglect our own selves. This is the way things go on, and I cannot account for it; and yet it is so. I do not mean that I am turning bad, but I must acknowledge that those resolutions of improving myself every day, of becoming more perfect, are liable to be forgotten altogether; but, language such as you have used electrifies more than the motions of the voltapile.

"What are we doing now? Well, the frame of a school-house for white and Indian children is up, in Cowiclan Valley (thirty-five miles from Victoria). Three or four Sisters will soon start the school; a great boon for the abandoned people of that valley. The Bishop is there at present to cast a glance on the work done and to settle difficulties and to calm the feelings of the Indians, much roused in consequence of several murders committed on the white people. Three bloody deeds have been perpetrated by them

quite lately. In their last attempt at revenge, thirty-nine white people fell victims of their savage fury. Poor people! Unhappy people in this world, with little hope for the next. They are generally excited by white men, and when they show any inclination to avenge the wrong done them, they are threatened with the severest punishments, and there is no priest to teach them the doctrine of peace and to preserve them from the evil that they are bringing on themselves. The Bishop thinks that a war of extermination is about to take place between the Indian and the white man, just as it is carried on in the States. The death of the last Indian will be the end of that murderous struggle.

"I hope that, if the priest we are expecting arrives in the fall, the Bishop will send me to Cowiclan to attend both that place and the Nanaimo Mission."

Very little has been done for the Indians thus far, but God evidently blesses the work, "thanks to the prayers of the people of Belgium." They should "gather a large harvest for the missions of poor Vancouver's Island."

"Our wooden Cathedral which, after all, is a very pretty church, is now too small for our congregation and too distant from the centre part of Victoria; we have to build a larger one. We have bought a fine lot for a church, and we have been collecting last week to pay for it. Work will soon commence to lay the foundations. I have too much work, as you see, to feel lonesome. Besides, I have all the comforts of life I can wish for. Instead of difficulties with my Bishop, as some predicted, I meet with nothing but the greatest esteem and consideration on his part, so great indeed that I declare I am really unworthy of it. I find here everything but crosses and sorrows. Still, I try to prepare myself for the time of trial; the crosses will come afterwards; I trust in God they will *find Charles Seghers ready to bear them.*

"In my church choir I have a Jew and a Protestant. The attractive power of music is wonderful. Just think, the Jew sings every Sunday: 'Et in unum Dominum, Jesum Christum.' The country is charmingly beautiful, but the climate is rather severe. But I do not mind the climate. As soon as I am really settled here or where God wishes me to be, I intend to make the necessary preparations to die as a soldier of Christ, on the scene of war, with the weapons in hand; if this be His holy will."

A young priest arrives from Louvain and brings a welcome letter from the Rector. He is happy to meet an old friend.

"I spent a few delightful hours with my old fellow-student. What an amount of news he had to tell me! But, strange to say, I have come to the conviction that I care no longer or Belgium; not a bit!"

The new priest is sent to the Indians, but does not relish them. Few priests "like the Indian descendants of our grandfather Adam."

"Their language is an abominable jargon. And their bodies! What a smell! How dirty! Everybody is not called to be a missionary among the Indians. *Pauci* vocati et non *multi.* And yet we sorely need Indian missionaries. If, however, they knew what *I* know about the white folks, etc., of our poor, forlorn Vancouver's Island, they would be glad to live among savages.

"I asked the Bishop recently to be sent to the Indians; a dry 'no' was all the answer I got. And yet something tells me that *if I live*, I shall be one day on an Indian mission. I think I would not find more troubles and crosses among the savages than I have here. And if I did find more, I would expect to find more consolations. My mystery of the living Rosary is the second sorrowful one."

In April, 1866, he writes to the Rector in Flemish, asking him to "send good, English-speaking priests."

"The Oblate Fathers will probably leave the diocese next August. Their departure will throw the care of the College and two Indian missions on our shoulders. Two new Indian missions have to be started on the western coast of the island where the savages have never seen a Catholic priest. I should like very much to go there, but the Bishop does not allow me to do so, because: (1.) You, yes you, Reverend Father—oh, I am still angry with you—said that my health was very weak. (2.) Because the Bishop wants me to live with him. (3.) Because the convent needs a priest who speaks French. I always thought as soon as another priest would come, I could go on an Indian Mission. Nothing of the kind. A few days ago I asked Monseigneur (it was the first time I asked him a favor): Why do you not write to Canada for a good priest to take charge of the convent and send me to the Indians on the western shore? On the following day the Bishop said to me: 'I have written to Canada for a priest.' I was full of joy, but he added, 'a priest for the savages and not to take your place here.' This destroyed all my hopes. As long as the Bishop lives, I fear, I will be nailed to Victoria.—'Non sicut ego volo, sed sicut tu.'

"Everything goes on well in convent and school. I do not think that there are anywhere better and holier Sisters than those under my direction. But, I am sorry to say, they are the cause that I am detained here instead of working among the Indians. The Bishop cannot refuse them anything.

"I am still living with the Bishop together with an Irish and a French priest. I am healthy and happy. The Bishop loves me as a son, and I love him as a true father. Oh! I cannot sufficiently thank God for this; the tears are now in my eyes. Pray and have others pray for our good Bishop; he will soon leave us for South America where he intends to collect."

WILLIAM STANG.

American College, Louvain.

(*To be continued.*)

THE HYMN "UT QUEANT LAXIS."

THE hymns for Vespers, Matins, and Lauds in the Office of the Nativity of S. John the Baptist, offer more than a slight difficulty to the casual reader. There is in their phraseology, as well as in the Sapphic stanzas in which they are written, a strong flavor of the classicism not found so strongly marked in the *Ambrosiani*. The poetic words recall the early melodiousness of the *Gradus ad Parnassum*—that indispensable guide and helpmate to the sublime heights! To the cleric who retains of his earlier studies only the recollection of their difficulties, and not of an enjoyable familiarity with their inner sweetness, these hymns will present rather unattractive features. In addition to the classicism of phraseology, he will meet exegetical difficulties. But in this last perplexity he will not be alone: for those who have taken the trouble to study the hymns of this Office with editorial care, have not been in complete harmony with respect to the interpretation.

The hymns are full of meat. In their closely knit rhythms they tell a great story, they paint a grand picture, of the Baptist. But in their very lack of diffuseness lie both the difficulty of a hasty translation, and the danger either of a vague, or of an erroneous interpretation. Another interest attaches to them on account of the use made of the first stanza by Guido of Arezzo, in his efforts to establish firmly his hexachord solmisation, and in the continued use of his syllables for the solmisation of the modern octave. It is the purpose of this paper to present an original and versified translation of the hymns into English, together with some account of their author, Paul the Deacon, and some exegetical comment on difficult passages.

Paul, sometimes called Warnefridus, after the name of his father, and surnamed the Deacon, was famous both as a *littérateur* and as a historian. Indeed, he has been styled the best historian of the middle ages. He was born in Friuli, the old Forum Julii, in the year 740. It is likely that he

studied at a famous school in his native city, and afterwards at Pavia. At about the age of twenty-three he was ordained deacon, and shortly after became Chancellor to Desiderius, the last king of the Lombards. When Charlemagne had defeated Desiderius and destroyed the Lombard kingdom, Paul retired into a Benedictine monastery, the famous Monte Cassino. At the request of Charlemagne he left the sweet solitude of the cloister for literary work in the royal court: but after a few years sought and obtained permission to return to his loved monastery. The date of his death is uncertain—probably about the year 798. His life was filled with historical labors which gave him a great reputation. Of his three historical works, perhaps the one most frequently referred to is his *De Gestis Longobardorum*, which, despite an unpleasing style and occasional inaccuracies, is esteemed very highly because of its collection of facts to be found recorded nowhere else. His Life of St. Gregory the Great is given by Mabillon in the first volume of his *Acta sanctorum ord. S. Benedicti*, and the Benedictine edition of St. Gregory's works places the Life as an Introduction.

What interests us most in the present connection is, however, his poetry. This, if we may credit the eulogy passed on it by one of his contemporaries, deserved to be ranked with the poetry of the classic ancients—the gigantesque Homer and the gentle-souled Virgil. Alas! we can judge of the correctness of this superlative praise only by the merits of one poem—and that one the *Ut queant laxis resonare fibris.* Shall we say, *Peperit semel sed leonem?* This is true of St. Thomas in his Eucharistic hymns, who in that sole theme demonstrated his poetic gifts indubitably and for all time. But it is very likely that Paul wrote many verses and on many various themes. *Tempus edax rerum* has left us only one hymn of his, and that one preserved from the fate of the others by its secure resting-place in the indestructible prayer of the indestructible Church.

The plain-chant melody of the hymn is a musical curiosity in the fact that at the commencement of each hemistich the melody rises a diatonic step above the degree on which the

previous hemistich had begun. Guido of Arrezzo, the Benedictine monk whose labors in the cause of sacred music have placed him in the forefront of the great names illustrating the history of music, was trying, early in the eleventh century, to introduce his hexachord system in the place of the old Greek tetrachords. Casting around for a set of syllables which, associated indubitably with certain tonal intervals, should fix these for the ear in whatever hexachord they might occur, he happened to notice the peculiarity of the melody of the *Ut queant.* Here was the very thing he sought, already associating certain sounds with certain syllables—a melody which had not to be taught to his pupils, as they knew it by heart. And so we have the solmisation lasting, with an added syllable to accommodate it to the octave system, down even into our own day. The word solmisation displays the history of its origin in the musical syllables—*Sol* and *Mi.*

Ut queant laxis
*Re*sonare fibris
*Mi*ra gestorum
*Fa*muli tuorum,
*Sol*ve polluti
*La*bii reatum,
Sancte Joannes!

The return to the heptachord system necessitated a new syllable for the seventh or leading note of our octave. In the year 1599 a musical theorist, Erich van der Putten, suggested the syllable *Bi* of *labii.* This would have continued the close fellowship of solmisation with our hymn. But a vast majority of theorists conceived and supported a happier syllable still than *Bi*, and out of the two initial letters of the last line of the stanza, Sancte Joannes, formed a syllable *Si*, which we now use. The flatted seventh receives in plainchant the name *Sa*, probably taken from the first word of the seventh and last line of the stanza as arranged above. On account of its open sound *Do* has been used instead of *Ut* in all countries but France. Various other syllables than

these traditional ones have been suggested by many theorists, but not one of their proposed substitutions has survived its author. The hymn has therefore acquired a musical renown far above the merits of its Gregorian setting, which, although quite rhythmic, has no great merit as a melody.

As has been already said, the hymn causes some little hesitation, if not difficulty, in its interpretation. The fourth stanza of the Vesper hymn has been translated variously. One critic thinks that the praise *uterque parens* refers to Our Lady and Elizabeth. While the whole stanza would lead naturally to this inference, obstacles are met in the masculine *uterque* and the single *nati meritis.*

Ventris obstruso recubans cubili
Senseras Regem thalamo manentem:
Hinc parens nati meritis uterque
Abdita pandit.

The scene painted is plainly that of the Visitation. When Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the infant Baptist leaped in her womb; and, filled with the Holy Ghost, she answered: "Blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me, that the *mother of my Lord* should come to me? For behold as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in my ears, the infant in my womb leaped for joy. And blessed art thou that hast believed, because *those things shall be accomplished that were spoken to thee by the Lord.*"

Elizabeth here, because of the Baptist's joy at the near presence of Christ, publishes mysteries she had not as yet heard—*abdita pandit.* And our Lady forthwith replies in the prophecy that all generations should call her blessed.

Again, *abdita pandit.* It was as though Elizabeth, through the merits of her son, was enabled to prophesy of Mary, and Mary, through the merits of her son, was enabled to foretell her own endless glory. But in this interpretation, so strongly intimated throughout the stanza, the verse should have *utraque* rather than *uterque* parens, and the *nati* would expect emendation. The consensus of opinion seems to

indicate Zachary and Elizabeth as the *uterque parens.* But in this case, what are the *abdita?* Pauly suggests the "Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel" for Zachary, and the "Benedicta tu in mulieribus" for Elizabeth. But this would seem to make the stanza lack continuity of sense, —as though the leaping of the infant Baptist caused one prophecy to be uttered at the same instant, and another three months afterwards. It seems to us that a more congruous meaning for *abdita* would be the name of John, which Elizabeth desired him to be called when the kinsfolk had suggested the name of his father. Their surprise at her desires was very reasonable, since, as they said, "There is none of thy kindred that is called by this name." Here was a *res abdita*, which assumed prophetic proportions when the father wrote the same mysteriously chosen name of John. And just as the child leaping in its mother's womb caused her to prophesy concerning Mary, so the very name of the Baptist was able to unloose the tongue of Zachary that he might prophesy of the coming Lord. The *hinc* of the third line would then be descriptive of time (afterwards), rather than of causality. That is, the stanza contains two illustrations of the power of the Baptist: the first, in the fact that he recognized and testified to the presence of the hidden Saviour; and the second, that after his birth he was the cause of the wonderful naming that surprised all the kinsfolk and neighbors, and that served to unloose the tongue of Zachary. Pauly places a semicolon after the second line, and the Breviary a colon. The sense of the interpretation we have just given would be better indicated by a period, although the colon would also permit readily that interpretation.

The translation used in the Marquis of Bute's Breviary makes the *uterque parens* refer to Our Lady and Elizabeth:

> Pent in the closet of the womb, thy Saviour
> Thou didst adore within His chamber shrined;
> Thus did each parent in their unborn offspring
> Mysteries find.

Apart from the question of the interpretation of the original, it is a weak version. "Mysteries *find*" for abdita *pandit* paints but half the picture, whose whole value is in the twofold *utterance* of the parents.

As usual, Caswall gives a flowing version. He takes the same meaning out of the *uterque:*

No marvel; since yet cloistered in the womb,
The presence of thy King had thee inspired:
What time Elizabeth and Mary sang,
With joy prophetic fired.

The crux of translators is the second stanza of the Hymn for Lauds:

Serta ter denis alios coronant
Aucta crementis, duplicata quosdam;
Trina te fructu cumulata centum
Nexibus ornant.

The reference is, of course, to the parable of the Sower. The seeds which fell upon good ground brought forth fruit, "some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, and some thirtyfold" (Matt. xiii, 8). And so, in Our Saviour's own explanation of the parable, they who hear the word, and understand, and bear fruit, yield, the one an hundredfold, and another sixtyfold, and another thirtyfold, (v, 23). But how shall these three divisions be clearly expressed in a translation? Caswall is not so happy here:

Of all the diadems that on the brows
Of Saints in glory shine,
Not one with brighter, purer halo glows,
In Heaven's high Court, than thine.

Better is the version of the Marquis of Bute's Breviary:

Saints with their crowns shall glitter, some with increase
Thirtyfold, some with double wreaths shall shine,
Yet shall no other diadem of glory
Glitter like thine.

But what does "double wreaths"—a literal translation of *duplicata*—mean? The idea in the mind of the author of the original seems to be rather "double wreaths" than a simple "sixtyfold." If that be so, the translator should similarly have given some parallel rendering to *trina*. St. Jerome and St. Athanasius assign the lowest of the three crowns to chaste nuptials; the next higher, to continent widows; the highest, to virgins. St. Augustine assigns the thirtyfold to marriage, the sixtyfold to virginity, the hundredfold to martyrdom. But neither of these interpretations would apply to a trinal crown for the Baptist. Had the author a unique application in mind? expecting that his readers would easily understand the threefold crown on the Baptist's brow to be, first, that of the Prophet; secondly, that of the Virgin; and thirdly, that of the Martyr? It may be: and in that case the *trina* would have a parallel meaning with duplicata—*i. e.*, *duplicata* would not then mean strictly sixtyfold, but simply a double crown: just as trina does not mean ninetyfold, but a triple crown.

The other scriptural allusions need no indications here, as they are obvious, and do not present any special difficulty to the translator. In the following translation we have tried to preserve a hint of the Sapphic rhythms, and with the same object in view have embarrassed ourselves—perhaps needlessly—with three double rhymes to the stanza. English verse yields itself but tardily and not gracefully at best, to such restrictions of rhyme and metre. Nevertheless, such a charm lingers about the cadences of the original Sapphic stanza of the Hymn, that a translator who presents his version to the eyes of those who are familiar with the pleasant rhythms of the original, may well pause ere he relinquish the task of a close imitation.

IN I. VESPERIS.

Ut queant laxis resonare fibris
Mira gestorum famuli tuorum,
Solve polluti labii reatum,
Sancte Joannes.

Nuntius celso veniens olympo,
Te patri magnum fore nasciturum,
Nomen et vitæ seriem gerendæ,
Ordine promit.

Ille promissi dubius superni,
Perdidit promptæ modulos loquelæ;
Sed reformasti genitus peremptæ
Organa vocis.

Ventris obstruso recubans cubili,
Senseras Regem thalamo manentem:
Hinc parens, nati meritis, uterque
Abdita pandit.

Sit decus Patri, genitæque Proli,
Et tibi, compar utriusque virtus
Spiritus semper, Deus unus, omni
Temporis ævo. Amen.

AT VESPERS.

That we thy servants may with freest blessing
Worthily praise thee, all thy works confessing,
Wash from our lips the stains of our transgressing,
Holy Precursor!

Lo! the Archangel from his heavenly dwelling,
Came to thy Father, thy great birth foretelling;
Breathèd thy Name, and told the worth excelling
Of thy high Mission.

Doubtful thy father hears the word from Heaven:
And lo! a sign to Zachary is given:—
Silence shall bind his lips, till it be riven
That he may name thee.

Though in thy mother's womb, with joyful leaping
Knew'st thou the King in bridal-chamber sleeping.
Each parent's lips, no longer silence keeping,
Tell hidden wonders.

Praise to the Father and the Son addressing,
And to the Spirit equal power possessing,
Let our lips offer, Triune God, a blessing
Through endless ages!

AD MATUTINUM.

Antra deserti teneris sub annis,
Civium turmas fugiens, petisti,
Ne levi posses maculare vitam
Crimine linguæ.

Præbuit durum tegumen camelus
Artubus sacris, strophium bidentes,
Cui latex haustum, sociata pastum
Mella locustis.

Cæteri tantum cecinere Vatum
Corde præsago jubar affuturum:
Tu quidem mundi scelus auferentem
Indice prodis.

Non fuit vasti spatium per orbis
Sanctior quisquam genitus Joanne,
Qui nefas sæcli meruit lavantem
Tingere lymphis.

Sit decus Patri, genitæque Proli,
Et tibi, compar utriusque virtus
Spiritus semper, Deus unus, omni
Temporis ævo. Amen.

AT MATINS.

Caves of the desert hid thy youthful being
When, from the city's sin and tumult fleeing,
Thou wouldst find shelter where should be no dreeing
Of the tongue's errors.

Gave thee the camel, when thou wentest thither,
Garments of hair; a sheep, the leathern girdle;
Streams gave thee drink; and locusts food, together
With the wild honey.

Lips of the prophets did but ope declaring
Orient Splendor unto men appearing:
Thy finger pointest out the Saviour, bearing
All the world's evil!

Never, ah! never through the earth's wide spaces
Man born of woman shone with richer graces;
Pouring on Him who the world-guilt effaces,
Jordan's clear waters.

Praise to the Father and the Son addressing,
And to the Spirit equal power possessing,
Let our lips offer, Triune God, a blessing
Through endless ages.

AD LAUDES.

O nimis felix, meritique celsi,
Nesciens labem nivei pudoris,
Præpotens martyr, nemorumque cultor,
Maxime Vatum.

Serta ter denis alios coronant
Aucta crementis, duplicata quosdam;
Trina te fructu cumulata centum
Nexibus ornant.

Nunc potens nostri meritis opimis
Pectoris duros lapides revelle,
Asperum planans iter, et reflexos
Dirige calles.

Ut pius mundi Sator et Redemptor,
Mentibus culpæ sine labe puris,
Rite dignetur veniens beatos
Ponere gressus.

Laudibus cives celebrent superni,
Te, Deus simplex pariterque Trine,
Supplices et nos veniam precamur,
Parce redemptis. Amen.

AT LAUDS.

Blessed exceeding thou with highest merit :
Stainless the snowy whiteness of thy spirit :
Mightiest Martyr, thou who didst inherit
Wisdom of Prophets.

Some crowns with glory thirtyfold are shining :
Others, a double flower and fruit combining :
Thy trinal chaplet bears an intertwining
Hundredfold fruitage.

O thou, whose glory all our souls dilate in,
Soften our hard hearts : save from ills that threaten :
Make smooth the rough ways, and the crooked straighten,
Unto the Saviour !

That He, our Maker and our Reconcilement,
Finding our bosoms free from sin's defilement,
Towards us may bend, amid our sad exilement,
His blessed footsteps.

Let hosts supernal praise Thee, brightly pressing,
Round the Great Throne, the Three in One confessing :
Lowly we pray Thee, pardon grant and blessing :
Spare the redeemèd.

H. T. HENRY.

Overbrook Seminary.

SOME NOTES ON THE PROJECTED REFORM OF THE ROMAN BREVIARY UNDER BENEDICT XIV.[1]

PART II.

In a former essay we told the story of the reform of the Roman office projected by the consultors of Benedict XIV. We showed how, in spite of a multiplicity of obstacles and the determined opposition of the reactionaries of the day, who did not scruple even to bespatter the fair name of the Sovereign Pontiff in support of the old service-books, the revision, after a delay of nearly six years, was at length accomplished, and a specimen of the new choir-manual laid in the hands of Benedict XIV.

In the present paper, after giving some account of the changes effected in the Breviary text, we shall show the Pontiff's appreciation of the work in question, the lines on which he himself would have carried out the reform, and how it came to pass that his brilliant scheme miscarried.

The modifications introduced into the *Proprium de tempore* were few, and only concerned the lessons.

For the passage in the third nocturn of the first Sunday of Advent, where St. Gregory sees in the calamities of his day the signs which should precede the end of the world, was substituted another passage from the same homily, where the Saint simply expresses the joy which Christ's advent will give to His people; the abbreviated and not very pleasing passage from St. Jerome, which forms the second nocturn lessons on the second Sunday of Advent, was replaced by a very beautiful and very theological quotation from St. Fulgentius, and for Christmas Eve was inserted a homily by St. Chrysostom treating in a more refined manner the subject which, in the Tridentine breviary, St. Jerome handles somewhat coarsely; St. Augustine's rather obscure homily for the Thursday after Ash-Wednesday, was replaced by another homily of the saint, but written in a clearer style

1 *Histoire du Breviaire Romain* par Pierre Batiffol.—Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils.

and on a less abstruse subject; for the homily of St. Ambrose on the Wednesday of the Lenten Ember Week, was substituted a more explicit and appropriate passage by St. Chrysostom, and, in place of St. Augustine's treatise on the symbolism of the number forty, on the following Friday, another passage by the same author. In deference to the opinion, at that time general in France, as to the non-identity of Mary of Bethany with St. Mary Magdalen, several homilies which affirmed the contrary view, were cut out and replaced by others which did not touch the debated question—viz., on the Wednesday after the fourth Sunday of Lent, St. Augustine's homily on Lazarus,—this was replaced by a very touching passage from St. Fulgentius,—" . . . *Jesus lacrymas fudit . . . Plorabat, sed non utique plorabat ut Iudaei putabant, quia Lazarum satis amabat. Sed ideo plorabat, quia iterum eum ad hujus vitae miserias revocabat*, etc." ;—on Passion Thursday, St. Gregory's *Cogitanti mihi, etc.*, and on Easter Thursday the same Saint's *Maria Magdalene quae, etc.* Finally St. Augustine's homily for Passion Wednesday was curtailed, the preface concerning the *Encaenia* being cut out, and, for no very ostensible reasons, the second nocturn lessons for Thursday within the octave of the Ascension, and the third nocturn lessons of the Twelfth Sunday after Pentecost were suppressed in favor of passages drawn respectively from St. Bernard and St. Ambrose.

Thus much for the *Proprium de tempore.* The amendments in the *Proprium Sanctorum* were more considerable.

First as to antiphons and responsories. Those proper to the festival of St. Andrew, drawn from his apocryphal life, were replaced by others taken from Scripture. So too the antiphons and responsories proper to St. Lucy, St. Agnes, St. Agatha, St. Lawrence, St. Caecilia and St. Clement, these fragments being all borrowed from *Acta* which the Congregation regarded with suspicion. The new antiphons and responsories were all taken from the *Commune Sanctorum.*

The first Antiphon at Lauds on the Feast of St. John the Evangelist—"Valde honorandus," etc., was replaced by

another more in accordance, it was said, with the text of the Gospel.

The passage *Senex puerum etc.* which forms the *Magnificat* antiphon at First Vespers, and the eighth response at Matins, on the feast of the Purification, and which has been falsely attributed to St. Augustine, was on this account replaced in each case by a response borrowed from the Antiphonary of St. Peter published by Tomasi (t. iv, p. 64) —*Nunc dimittis, etc.*, and which still, we believe, forms the sixth response of the Benedictine Purification Office.

The office of the Annunciation, too, was shorn of its third and eighth responsories, the Congregation being shocked at expressions—*Efficieris gravida, etc.* and *Cunctas haereses sola interemisti.*

On the other hand the festival of St. Thomas the Apostle —*ad majorem sancti apostoli celebritatem*—was enriched with proper antiphons, culled from the Gospel of St. John. So, too, the office of the Holy Innocents, Isaias and the Apocalypse being the sources whence they were taken.

Finally, the antiphon at the *Magnificat* of the second Vespers of St. Peter's Chair was replaced by the repetition of the *Magnificat* antiphon of first Vespers—*Tu es pastor ovium, etc.*, and the proper antiphons and responsories of St. Elizabeth, of Portugal, whose feast was debased to simple rank, were on this account necessarily suppressed.

The changes introduced into the sanctoral lectionary were much greater. First as to the *Historiæ Sanctorum.*

For the legend of St. Andrew, "since modern critics hold it to be false and supposititious, as Tillemont has clearly shown," was substituted an extract from a sermon by St. Chrysologus,—a simple panegyric of the Apostle with no historical allusion.

For the *acta* of St. Thomas—"of doubtful authenticity and contested by many critics," we have a sermon by St. Chrysostom, on the Saint's incredulity.

For the *acta* af St. Barnabas—"*innituntur actis spuriis*" —a simple commentary on the canonical acts, by St. Chrysostom.

For the *acta* of St. Barnabas—"seeing that nothing is known of the Apostle save what is recounted in Scripture," a sermon by the Venerable Bede on the Twelve Apostles.

For the fourth and fifth lessons of St. Matthew—"on account of the uncertainty of the things there related concerning the Apostle," a sermon by St. Chrysostom, and an extract from St. Epiphanius.

Moreover, the fourth, fifth and six lessons for the feast of St. Peter's Chair (August 1st) were suppressed "for almost all critics contest the accuracy of the narrative there related," and, in their place, for lessons four and five, a sermon by St. Chrysostom, for lesson six, a precise exposition of the titles of authenticity of the Chairs which are preserved in the Basilica of San Pietro in Vincoli on the Esquiline Hill.

The Second Nocturn lessons, too, were cut out from the Office of Our Lady of Snow, and replaced by a sermon by St. Bernard which makes no allusion to the legendary founding of the Liberian Basilica, the accuracy of which seemed to the consultors very questionable,—*Lectiones secundi nocturni, quae hac die usque modo recitatae sunt, immutandas sane esse existimatur. De ea solemnitate, quae hac die celebratur, ejusque institutionis causa, habentur, ait Baronius in Martyrologio Romano, vetera monumenta et Mss. Hujusmodi autem monumenta et Mss. nec unquam vidimus, nec fortasse unquam videbimus. Mirandum profectum est, ait Baillet. non adhuc tanti miraculi et tam mirabilis historiae auctorem innotuisse; insuper quod tam novum tamque stupendum prodigium spatio annorum fere mille et amplius profundo sepultum silentio jacuerit, nec usquam inveniri potuerit, praeterquam in breviario et in Catalogo Petri de Natalibus, lib. 7, cap. 21.* (*Analecta Juris pontificii t. xxiv, p. 915.*)

Moreover, the *acta* of the following saints were likewise suppressed on the ground that they were either false or doubtful, or contained false or doubtful matter, or were otherwise inappropriate :—St. Nicholas, (December 6th); St. Lucy, (December 13th); St. Blaise, (February 3rd); SS. Marius, Martha and Audifax, (February 5th); SS. Tiburtius, Vale-

rian and Maximus, (April 14th); St. Caius, April 22d); St. Cletus, (April 26th); St. Alexander, Eventius, Theodulus and Juvenal, (May 3rd); SS. Gordianus and Epimachus, (May 10th); SS. Nereus and Achilleus, (May 12th); St. Pudentiana, (May 19th); St. Urban, (May 25th); SS. Basilides, Cyrinus, Nabor and Nazarius, (June 12th); SS. Vitus and Modestus, (June 15th); SS. Processus and Martinian, (July 2d); St. Praxedes, (July 21st); SS. Abdon and Sennen, (July 30th); SS. Cyriacus, Largus and Smaragdus, (August 8th); St. Hippolytus, (August 13th); St. Timotheus, (August 23rd); St. Adrian, (September 8th); St. Gorgonius, (September 9th); SS. Protus and Hyacinth, (September 11th); St. Nicomedes, (September 15th); St. Callistus, (October 14th), and St. Mennus, (November 11th).

So too, and on similar grounds, we have the excerption of the historical lessons of the following saints, in whose case, however, the old legends were replaced by new ones, or rather, they were corrected and re-written:—St. Damasus, (December 11th); St. Silvester, (December 31st); St. Hilary, (January 14th); St. Felix, (January 14th); St. Paul the Hermit, (January 15th); St. Marcellus, (January 16); St. Anthony, (January 17th); St. Fabian, (January 20th); St. Polycarpe, (January 26th); St. Chrysostom, (January 27th); St. John of Matha, (February 8th); SS. Perpetua and Felicitas, (March 7th); Forty Martyrs, (March 10th); St. Pius V, (May 5th); St. Peter Celestine, (May 19); St. Felix (Pope), (May 30th); SS. Peter and Marcellinus, (June 2d); SS. Primus and Felician, (June 9th); St. Margaret of Scotland, (June 10th); SS. Mark and Marcellian, (June 18th); SS. Gervasius and Protasius, (June 19th); St. Paul of Nola, (June 22d); St. Elizabeth, (July 8th); St. John Gaulbertus, (July 12th); St. Apollinaris, (July 23rd); SS. Nazarius, Celsus, Victor and Innocent, (July 28th); St. Martha, (July 29th); Pope Stephen, (August 2d), St. Xystus, (August 6th); SS. Tiburtus and Susanna, (August 11th); St. Clara, (August 12th); St. Philip Benitius, (August 23rd); St. Stephen of Hungary, (September 2d); SS. Cornelius and Cyprian, (September 16th); St. Januarius, (September 19th);

St. Maurice, (September 22d); St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, (November 17th); St. Caecilia, (November 22d); St. Clement, (November 23), and St. Chrysogonus, (November 24th).

New second nocturn lessons were also given to the Dedication of St. John Lateran and to the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross.

We next come to homilies and sermons, a certain number of which were suppressed on the ground that they were apocryphal. Thus the sermon attributed to St. Augustine, in the second nocturn of Innocents' Day, was replaced by a fragment from St. Bernard, "that everything uncertain or suspect may be banished from our breviary." So, too, the alleged sermons of St. Augustine at the second nocturn of the Purification, and at the second nocturn of the festival of St. Peter's Chair at Rome, were replaced respectively by passages from St. Bernard and St. Cyprian. Likewise, the apocryphal sermons of St. Chrysostom at the second nocturn of the Visitation, were replaced by a passage from St. Bernard.

Similarly on the feast of St. John Gaulbert. For the three homilies attributed to St. Jerome, "since the first only is authentic, the others being taken from an apocryphal sermon of St. Augustine," were substituted homilies by St. Chrysostom.

Finally, on the feast of St. Joachim, we have the suppression of the three last lessons, a fragment by St. John Damascene "seeing that learned men generally hold that the matter which they contain is drawn from apocryphal sources."

This part of the consultors' revision is far from complete. Dom Morin, O. S. B., of Maredsous (Belgium), has recently shown that in the actual Roman Breviary there are no less than fifty apocryphal sermons, though it is only fair to add that the greater number of these are of comparatively recent introduction.

In the *Commune Sanctorum*, only two corrections of importance were made.

In the *Commune Evangelistarum* and in the *Commune plurimorum Martyrum* (2d place) the consultors substituted

for the actual passages from St. Gregory and St. Ambrose, others by the same authors, better adapted, it was said, to the evangelical texts and more pious.

Such were the alterations introduced into the official text. We shall now see what the Pope thought of them.

To say, as some have said, that the Soverign Pontiff would have in reality no reform of that Breviary which he had set his consultors ro revise, would be altogether untrue. Benedict was open as the day. As his old friend Cardinal de Tencin pointed out, he was a man incapable not only of falsehood, but even of the least concealment. At the same time he was far too prudent and circumspect not to foresee what a storm of opposition so radical a reform as that proposed by his consultors would undoubtedly raise up.

On February 8, 1743, when the Congregation had been at work about eighteen months, we find him writing to Cardinal de Tencin :—"The project of a new Roman Breviary is beautiful and good, nor is the execution of the plan impossible, but it must be thought well over first. The world has come to such a pass nowadays, that if the Pope attempts anything, those whom it pleases are for him, those whom it displeases against him, and since it is impossible that the same thing should please every one, annoyance and contradiction, from one side or the other must needs be his lot." And on the 26th of April : "As to a new Roman Breviary, I recognize not only its utility, but even its necessity, and I am ready to take it in hand, for I have been accustomed to work hard all my life and am prepared if need be, to die in harness. But, my dear Cardinal, men have nowadays so little regard for the authority of the Holy See, that the opposition of a single monk is sufficient to balk the execution of any project however pious, or however useful. This I experience at every turn, to say nothing of the murmurs of some who wear the same habit as your Eminence. To see them shudder when the new Breviary is mentioned, you would think we were going to make a new creed."

"But, notwithstanding all this, and *non obstantibns quibuscunque*, in concert with your Eminence, I will see what

can be done in the matter." And a few days later, on May the third: "I have not given up the idea of a new Roman Breviary, but, I frankly acknowledge to your Eminence that I cannot help fearing the opposition which this grand project will meet with, not only here, but also on the other side of the Alps."

Thus wrote Benedict in 1743. At length, when his consultors had finished their labors, he was bitterly disappointed with the result. "Would to God," he wrote to Cardinal Tencin on the seventh of August, 1740, five months after Valenti had placed the new Breviary in his hands, "would to God I had worked at it alone myself. Had I done so, the revision would have been completed long ago. I appointed a commission, however, instead, and at length they have communicated to me their ideas—ideas so confused, so involved, so contradictory, that it will be more trouble to correct their correction, than to correct the Breviary itself. But if God only gives me life and health, we shall yet have our revised Breviary." If we may judge from the following very curious letter, he might have added with perfect truth, that his consultors' ideas of revision were not sufficiently advanced to meet his own opportunist views: "I have to acknowledge the receipt of your Eminence's letter of May 20th," wrote Benedict XIV to Cardinal Tencin, on June 7, 1743. "As to the project of a new Roman Breviary to which you there allude, I note with the greatest pleasure the good hope which your Eminence gives that if we provide a new Roman Breviary, it may perhaps be received in France, at least in those dioceses in which the Roman Breviary is now in use." "The following is the general scheme which I propose to follow in the redaction of this breviary."

"Critics have become so punctilious, and the facts which our good forefathers regarded as indubitable being nowadays called in question, I see no means of sheltering ourselves from censure except by compiling a Breviary in which all shall be taken from Holy Scripture, which, as your Eminence knows, contains many things concerning the mysteries celebrated in the Church's feasts, the Apostles and the Holy

Virgin ; and what Holy Scripture does not furnish we shall supply from the uncontested writings of the early Fathers." . . . "As to the other Saints now honored in the Breviary, we shall content ourselves by simply commemorating them. All that can be said is, that this is a novelty which will diminish the cultus hitherto paid to the saints in question, and I am very sure that the excerption of their legends will create no little outcry amongst those who hold the facts there recounted as so true that they are ready to become martyrs in support of them."

"The criticism, however, of such persons seems to me of much less importance than that to which we lay ourselves open by making people read in the name of the Church accounts, either apocryphal or uncertain. But, be the care and ability bestowed on the redaction of the new Breviary never so great, I am quite sure criticism will not be wanting."

Benedict, moreover, could ill brook the interference of others in matters which he felt he could manage better alone. "It is difficult," he was fond of saying, "for the man who thinks he knows how to do a thing, to let others do it for him," and the revision of the Breviary was one of those things which the Pontiff thought he knew how to accomplish. Nor are we prepared to say that in this he was mistaken. One of the most brilliant scholars who ever sat in St. Peter's chair, the throes of authorship were to him a veritable delight, he always felt at home in his study, and was never so happy as when he was writing a book. "The Pope," Cardinal de Tencin, once said of him to Cardinal Fleury, "the Pope fairly itches to make books and decrees," and as a matter of fact he found in study his only recreation. Benedict then set himself bravely to work, but somehow or other the revision still hung fire.

The truth was, he could never find sufficient time to devote to it. On the twenty-fifth of September, 1743, we find him writing to Cardinal de Tencin : "As to the Roman Breviary, I have again taken the matter in hand, but to complete the revision needs more time than I can give it, for I am not only besieged, but literally overwhelmed with busi-

ness." Seven years later, the work was not yet done, but the Pope was still thinking of it. "Two tasks remain for me to accomplish," he writes, on August 15th, 1755, "one relative to the Sacraments of the Eastern Church, the other an honest correction of our Breviary—*é onesta correzione del nostro Breviario.*" "I have no fear of work, nor lack of materials," —he was alluding perhaps to the research of his commission, perhaps to his own labors in the same field,—"but," he adds, with a touch of sadness, "what I want is a little more time, and that is just what I have not got, and if perchance I do find a few spare moments, then I feel the weight of my infirmities and of my years." And, on the 18th of February, 1756: "If God give me life and health I shall complete a little work on the matter and form of the Sacraments in the Eastern Church." "Why am I so old, and held prisoner by the gout, and withal so pre-occupied with the affairs of the West?" The question of the Greek ritual then was almost settled, and the turn of the Breviary was coming at last. "But the task is so hard," he wrote on April 16th, 1758, in what must have been a last letter to his old friend at Paris, "and the age is so difficult to please." Less than three weeks later, on May 4th, 1758, Benedict XIV died, and we are still waiting for an honest correction of our Breviary.

F. E. GILLIAT SMITH.

Bruges, Belgium.

SUSPENSION "EX INFORMATA CONSCIENTIA."

ARTICLE II.

Conditions authorizing the Bishop to have recourse to Suspension *ex informata.* The case must be lawful—serious—supported by convincing proof—to be tested, if necessary, by the Roman tribunals. Two fold advantage of such a course. Proofs need not be collated in the same manner as for ordinary trials—judicial reasons for this. Critical examination of the evidence required. Private knowledge of the delinquent's life on the part of the Bishop—does it furnish sufficient ground for a suspension *ex informata?* Evidence which holds good in all cases. How to obtain the same. Practical advice as to the preservation and use of such evidence.

WE come now to investigate in detail the causes which authorize a Bishop to enforce suspension *ex informata conscientia* against a cleric; in other words, to determine the nature of the crimes which may be punished by this censure.

Every departure from common law is to be interpreted in its rigorous sense, especially if it be a case, as is the one we consider, called in canonical language "*a jure exorbitans.*" Hence the usual method of procedure is to be followed in every instance not positively excepted by the Council in the chapter "*Cum honestius.*"

From the text of the Council and from the well known intentions of those who framed and drew it up, we know that the matter which justifies a Bishop to proceed "*ex informata conscientia*" and so inflict a censure, should be: (1.) Lawful. (2.) Occult, (we shall determine the canonical meaning of this word later on.) (3.) Serious.

At first sight there does not appear to be much necessity for insisting on the first condition; however, it may not be entirely useless to determine what is understood by the term "lawful" as applied to the proof of guilt required here, and to point out how it should be established if required. It must be borne in mind that a Bishop, although he is not obliged to base his decision on a regular trial, is by no means at liberty to dispense with all proofs or evidence against an ecclesiastic charged with grave offence. There need not be, it is true, a perfect chain of proof against the accused

such as would lead to a judicial conviction in the courts; but the proofs should exist. Natural equity demands them. "Roman Congregations," says Bishop Messmer,[1] the teaching of Canonists, and the very nature of the Tridentine suspension, leave no doubt that the Bishop must be fully convinced of the guilt of the person against whom he intends to proceed, before he may use the remedy. . . ." The Bishop must not forget that the cleric who considers himself unjustly suspended may have recourse to Rome, and then, it will be incumbent on the Bishop to show the nature and weight of the reasons which justified his extra-judicial action and made it a necessity. Prudence and self-protection call for a precise determination of these motives from the very start, to say nothing of their necessity as a check to all ill-advised or hasty use of a very important power. The collection of proofs which the Bishop may have to submit to a higher tribunal gives him opportunity to weigh the value of the evidence, and this does away with the danger of his being led to abuse his authority. In the present case the formality of collecting evidence is not the same as in public trials. There must be positive evidence of guilt, and not merely suspicion; furthermore, the process of obtaining proofs against the delinquent is very brief, and everything connected with it is to be kept an absolute secret. But with these few differences the general outline of the procedure should be the same as for public trials; and this, if for no better reason, as a matter of prudence. Bouix gives some practical advice on this subject:[2] "Before thinking of inflicting the suspension *ex informata*," says he, "it would be well to determine not only the guilt of the ecclesiastic, but also to find out if there be any evidence, documentary or otherwise, which could be used as proof before the Roman Congregations, if such a course should become necessary."

Some may ask, on what grounds does a Canonist take it upon themselves to offer this advice. We answer, on the liberty given the ecclesiastic to appeal to Rome. Appeal is

1 *Canonical Procedure*, Sec. II, Art. 3, No. 95, p. 160.
2 *Op. cit.* II. p 349.

something correlative, and obliges the one against whom it is urged, to substantiate his action by solid reasons. From the fact that the censure is extra-judicial, the motives on which it is based need not have a judicial character, but they should be strong and solid enough to convince any disinterested party. I admit that it may be a delicate undertaking to examine arguments of this class, but something of the kind is required ; a clear statement of facts becomes all the more necessary, the more we appreciate the difficulty of the case and realize the doubts and hesitations in which a superior finds himself when he is called upon to take a decisive action. It may happen that the Bishop knows to a certainty the guilt of the priest whom he has to censure, but still he is not at liberty to divulge to others the proofs which are convincing to him. For instance, if the Bishop had been witness to the crime, or if the culprit had made an avowal of his guilt, could the Bishop punish in such cases? The author of the *Praelectiones S. Sulpitii* has no hesitation in answering in the affirmative, alleging as his reasons that the Ordinary in such cases is not to be considered so much in the capacity of a judge as in that of an administrator in his diocese, and since his position of Bishop puts him above all suspicion, the Congregations would take his testimony as sufficient proof.[1] I must confess that I cannot share this opinion. There are cases, it is true, when the law gives the Bishop a large measure of authority, especially in matters which require such safeguards in order to prevent occurrences detrimental to the discipline of the diocese. In such cases, an appeal does not suspend the sentence of the Bishop.

1 *Op. cit. III*, p 109. Ex facultate reo data recurrendi ad S.S. contra irrogatam sententiam, nonnulli concludunt Episcopum non posse illum condemnare, si ipse solus testis fuerit delicti, vel si delinquens in colloquio privato suum crimen confessus fuerit, quia hujusmodi probationes valent pro solo Episcopo, et non possunt crimen certum facere apud S. Congregationem. Non arbitramur repugnare quin Episcopus, sin ut judex, saltem quatenus administrator suae dioecesis, procedat contra aliquem, quando ex scientiâ privatâ illum noxium certo cognoverit. Aliunde, Episcopus qui se asserit testem ocularem delicti, obtinere potest pro sua integritate et prudentia in agendo, ut S. Congregatio habeat illius affirmationem pro sufficiente probatione.

But I am not of the opinion that the same interpretation holds good for the suspension "ex informata." This would be a practical refusal of the right of *recursus*, and the appeal being a slight matter when compared to the possible excesses which the unrestrained action of the Bishop may lead to, I am opposed to anything which might limit or curtail the privilege of an appeal. As supreme administrator, it is for the Bishop to determine the fitness of employing an extra-judicial remedy, instead of following the ordinary procedure; but while inflicting the punishment he must take the responsibility of his action and act as judge. Now, everyone knows that where a judge has to pass sentence, he must confine himself to the evidence put before him, "ex probatis et allegatis," and not act from his personal knowledge. I think, therefore, that no weight should be attached to private views and personal acquaintance with the case on the part of the Bishop; for it is equivalent to placing an innocent person in the impossibility of clearing himself, and condemning him to bear an unjust and unmerited punishment without hope or power of appeal. This view is indorsed by the action of the Roman Congregations, as may be seen from what Mgr. Messmer states:[1] "A mere assertion by the Bishop is not enough. If the complainant brings evidence to the contrary, the Congregation orders the suspension to be removed, at least with the clause "Cum reincidentiâ," or if the reason clearly appear unjust, declares it void.

This important point being settled, we need but cursorily examine the more common phases of the case. The bishop may have collected proof enough to convince others as well as himself. These proofs are of the nature of judicial evidence, but they are not received with the formalities usually accompanying the taking of evidence. This does not mean that every allegation which is substantiated against the accused is to be taken as proof; on the contrary. The peculiar condition of the delinquent, the impossibility in which he finds himself of filing exceptions or making explanations, impose on the bishop a duty of leaning more to the side of leniency and clemency than to rigor and severity.

1 Op. cit. No. 95, p. 160.

How is the bishop to collect evidence? His own tact and judgment are to direct him in this. He is at liberty to look everywhere for proofs, and he can use everything pointing to the guilt of the accused. He may summon the priest before him, he may call witnesses, but, as we said before, the utmost secrecy being required, no minutes of the evidence can be taken, and everything which might lead to the divulging of the alleged crime, assuming that it is a secret, must be carefully avoided.[1]

The following suggestion will, we think, be useful to any individual bishop and enable him to keep all the proceedings secret, whilst it will, at the same time, furnish him with a memorandum of all the evidence he may be asked to produce if the case be carried to Rome. After the examination of the accused and of the witnesses, the bishop himself should draw up a summary of all the facts elicited in evidence, taking special care to note the dates and all points confirming the direct testimonies. No names should be mentioned. In addition to these depositions and documents bearing on the case, he will add his own observations and make out a brief statement of the leading points, if possible in a manner which will be intelligible to himself alone. He should enclose all this in a sealed envelope, noting on the outside the date of the suspension and its duration. Such memorandum should not be put among the official papers and documents of the diocese; but should be considered as belonging to the private papers of the bishop. If no appeal be lodged against the sentence, the bishop should destroy all such notes on the day on which the suspension expires. If the bishop should die in the meantime, the suspension ceases by the very fact, and all the papers bearing on the case should be destroyed by the administrator, who is positively forbidden to read them, or to make any use whatever of them.[2]

G. PÉRIES.

1 It will be well to make witnesses promise under oath not to reveal either their depositions, or the fact of their examination.—*Messmer op. cit.* No. 97, p. 163.

2 Analecta Juris Pont. xix, p. 1129.

ANALECTA.

E S. CONGREGATIONE CONCILII.

BENEDICTIO MULIERIS POST PARTUM.

Perillustris ac Rme Ene uti Fr.—Relato in S. Congregatione Concilii postulato ab Amplitudine Tua proposito in litteris diei 17 Ianuarii p. p. circa benedictionem mulierum post partum, Emi Patres tibi communicari mandarunt decretum S.C.SS.RR. diei 13 Iunii 1893. Quod quidem decretum ita se habet: "S.R.C. decernit benedictionem mulieris post partum fieri debere a Parocho si expetitus ipse fuerit, *posse* autem fieri a quocumque Sacerdote, si expetitus ipse pariter fuerit, in quacumque Ecclesia vel oratio publico, certiore facto superiore Ecclesiae."

Deum interim precor, ut cuncta fausta concedat eidem Amplit. Tuae cui me profiteor.

Uti Fratrem stud.

A. *Card.* DIPIETRO, *Praef.*

B. ARCHIEPS. NAZIA. *Pro-Secrius.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

I.

QUAENAM SUNT ORATORIA PUBLICA?

Emus ac Rmus Dnus Cardinalis Christianus Ernestus Bourret, Episcopus Ruthenen. Sacram Rituum Congregationem pro sequentis Dubii solutionem enixe rogavit, nimirum.

Utrum post Decretum generale die 9 Decembris 1895 editum *de Missa conformi Officio Ecclesiae vel Oratorii*

publici, Calendario loci, an vero celebrantis respondere debeant Missae quae celebrantur in Capellis Episcoporum, Seminariorum, Collegiorum, Piarum Communitatum, Hospitalium, et Carcerum ?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio referente subscripto Secretario, exquisita sententia Commissionis Liturgicae, reque maturo examine perpensa proposito Dubio respondendum censuit: "Dummodo agatur de Capella principali, quae instar Oratorii publici ad effectum memorati Decreti habenda est, *Affirmative* ad I.^{um}, *Negative* ad II.^{um}.

Atque ita rescripsit die 22 Maii 1896.

✠ CAJ. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *S.R.C., Praef.*
A. TRIPEPIS, *S.R.C., Secr^{ius}.*

II.

CORONAE MORTUARIAE IN PARIETIBUS ECCLESIAE.

Rmus Dnus Tobias Patroni Episcopus Valven. et Sulmonen., timens ne, sub specie pietatis erga defunctos, sensim, subrepant abusus decorem Domus Dei temerantes, a Sacra Rituum Congregatione sequentis Dubii solutionem humillime postulavit, nimirum:

An deceat in parietibus Ecclesiae vel publici Oratorii suspendere coronas mortuarias ut inibi maneant?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii, exquisito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, omnibusque mature perpensis, rescribendum censuit: *Negative.*

Atque ita rescripsit, die 22 Maii 1896.

✠ CAJ. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *S.R.C., Praef.*
A. TRIPEPIS, *S.R.C., Secr^{ius}.*

CONFERENCES.

DR. LITTLEDALE'S "PLAIN REASONS."

Qu. In view of the arguments, held out by Catholic writers against the validity of Anglican Orders, and intended to bring home to honest Episcopalians the necessity of seeking certainty and safety in the Roman Church, our clergy ought to keep informed on the literature to which Anglicans appeal for resisting such invitation. Many of them answer that Canon Littledale's "Plain Reason's" present very strong arguments, both historical and ethical, why an Episcopalian should *not* join the Roman Catholic Church. Has any Catholic writer explicitly noticed this book in a way to furnish some refutation of the supposed *plain reasons?*

Resp. Dr. Littledale's "*Plain Reasons Against Joining the Churh of Rome*," which was published in 1880 under the auspices of the English "Christian Knowledge Society," was at once answered in a trenchant way by Fr. Ryder of the Oratory. (Catholic Controversy. A reply to Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons." London: Burns and Oates, 1881.) But it has received its most effective refutation from its own camp. Dr. Frederick George Lee, an eminent divine and vicar of All Saints', Lambeth, indignantly repudiates Dr. Littledale's attempted defense of the Anglican position, and believes that the book is a disgrace to every honest member in his communion. It appears that after Father Ryder's refutation, together with several other severe criticisms from various quarters, had challenged the honesty of Dr. Littledale, he found himself obliged to make certain retractions of false statements. These were embodied in letters sent to *The Guardian and Church Times* and in the *errata* of subsequent editions of the book. The corrections to which Dr. Littledale was thus forced amounted already in the second edition to over *two hundred.* These, as analyzed by Rev. Lee, regarded historical or traditional facts (51); dogmatic and theoretical facts (43); quotations half made, often with

certain remarkable omissions and qualifications, and consequently, for purposes of controversy unfairly quoted (59); short scraps of quotations from the Fathers, which, when sought out and studied, were found to bear an entirely different meaning from that which they were credited (24), etc. If it is remembered that the book originally contained not quite 200 pages, it must be admitted that such "reckless carelessness and slovenly scholarship," to use Dr. Lee's words, are amazing in a man of Dr. Littledale's standing and assumption.

Mr. Shirley Brabason, of Stoke, Oxfordshire, expressed the following sentiment in regard to the book: "A book which has been corrected in nearly a hundred cases (Dr. Littledale found himself obliged to prefix to his second edition, in 1881, no less than twenty-nine pages, closely printed, "additions and corrections") should have been first submitted to some competent author . . . before being put in print. It shakes our confidence in the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.* The book *cannot, of course, mislead any one who is really acquainted with ecclesiastical history and dogmatic theology* (italics ours), but how very few of its readers will know that it is little more than a crude congeries of fallacies and erroneous statements, taken at second hand, which have been exposed and refuted again and again."

Unfortunately more than 35,000 copies had been sold before these corrections were made, and the harm of first impressions can hardly have been undone by the subsequent (half measure) admissions from the author, or the protests of such men as the Rev. Wentworth Hankey, of Christ Church, Oxford, who writes:

"I shall be much obliged if you will allow me, as an Anglican clergyman who prefers Dr. Littledale's past to his present views, to express the shame and indignation with which I have from the first regarded the publication of 'Plain Reasons' . . . I protest in the name of our common Christianity against any such attempt to weaken the hands of the Church."

Further testimony from Protestant sources may be found in Richard Quigley's "Mary the Mother of Christ." 1892. (Pustet & Co.)

Dr. Littledale's controversial methods have received kindred chastisement from such men as Father James Jones, the English Jesuit theologian (Dishonest Criticism: Being a Chapter of Theology on Equivocation, etc. London: John Hodges.) There is another book which occurs to us in this connection as a useful offset to Dr. Littledale's warning, namely, Luke Rivington's *A Plain Reason for Joining the Church of Rome.* It was intended originally as a reply to Mr. Gore's "Roman Catholic Claims," and shows very thoroughly the justice of those claims.

A PRIEST OFFICIATING AT A MARRIAGE OF NON-CATHOLICS.

Qu. In a small settlement, which is occasionally visited by a missionary priest, it happens that the latter is called upon by two non-Catholics to unite them in the bonds of marriage. He hesitates, but on learning that there is no Protestant minister or Justice of the Peace to perform the ceremony for them, and that they are not willing to go elsewhere or wait, he marries them, after ascertaining that there is no *natural* impediment to a lawful marriage on their part. Was this course right?

Resp. As the priest in such marriages acts only as the authorized witness of a natural contract, he is at liberty to assume for non-Catholics the office of civil magistrate by publicly attesting their marriage. The law recognizes him as the proper functuary in such cases.

On the other hand, such action should be restricted to cases of necessity, and care be taken lest it be misconstrued into an admission that the marriage contract between such persons—if baptized—is not a sacrament. Some eighteen months ago the Archbishop of New Orleans received from the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda a letter answering the question "utrum liceat sacerdoti catholico tamquam ministrum civilem se habere in celebratione matrimoniorum

Protestantium," as follows: "id licitum esse, hoc enim casu sacerdos est tamquam testis auctorizabilis."—(See AMERICAN ECCL. REVIEW, April, 1895, pp. 343, 344.)

CAN A PRIEST PERFORM THE FUNERAL RITES OVER A NON-CATHOLIC?

Qu. Assuming that the foregoing question is answered in the affirmative, let me ask: Can a priest (without sacerdotal vestments and ritual) *officiate* at the burial of a non-Catholic friend? Suppose that the departed has a Catholic wife, and that the friends who arrange the funeral anxiously desire the priest to perform the act, being unwilling to have any Protestant minister or layman assume the duty.

Or could a priest, as a personal friend of the family, perform the last rites over a nominal Catholic, who is not entitled to burial in consecrated ground?

A number of us have at various times discussed these cases; they are of more or less practical importance in these Western regions, and we have agreed to submit them to you for decision.

Resp. No, a priest cannot lawfully perform the ceremony of burial for a deceased non-Catholic or one who, having been baptized a Catholic, has defected. The presence of a priest *officiating* at the burial cannot be construed as a civil function, for the act of consigning a person to his grave requires no authorized witness, like the contract of marriage. The burial service of the Catholic ritual is a religious function in which we cannot share with those who deny the truth of our faith and worship, for we should implicitly, by our service, sanction the protest of the deceased against the Catholic religion. Of course there are cases where a priest may and should bury those who are not of his faith, just as he may pray for them *privately*.

WHO IS THE AUTHOR OF "THE UNERRING AUTHORITY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH?"

Qu. I have in my possession a small volume entitled: "*The Unerring Authority of the Catholic Church in Matters of Faith. Maintained against the exceptions of a late author, in his answer to*

a letter on the subject of Infallibility; or a Theological Dissertation; in which the Infallibility of the Church of Christ is demonstrated from innumerable texts of Scripture, from the Creed, from the Fathers, and Perpetual Tradition. To which are prefixed eight preliminaries, by way of introduction to the true Church of Christ. —London: Printed. Philadelphia: reprinted for T. Lloyd, 1789."

It was published in Philadelphia by subscription as the list of names prefixed to the volume indicates, but there is no author's name either on title page or at the end of the preface. The book ought to be reprinted, for it is a fine argument to light up the doubts of men outside of the Church who are in quest of positive truth.

Is it known who the author of the book was? I imagine that copies of it may still be found in various Catholic libraries, and it would be interesting to know to whom our Catholic American ancestors of the last century were indebted for so clever a defence of the claims of the Catholic Church as the one Church of Christ.

Resp. The author is Dr. Challoner, Vicar Apostolic of London. He became a Catholic in 1709, at the age of twenty, and died in 1781. (See Finotti, pag. 29 ref. to "Challoner and his Life," by James Bernard. London, 1784.)

THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE BROWN SCAPULAR AND THE CONFRATERNITY OF MT. CARMEL.

We have been anxious to clear up the doubts in reference to the arguments on the subject of the Brown Scapular; accordingly we presented various different views on the subject. P. Putzer, C.SS.R., comments upon the recent controversy between the Very Rev. Provincial F. Pius and Fr. Griffin, as follows:

The contention of the V. Rev. Provincial Pius in the June number of THE REVIEW (page 558), is on the whole correct. He speaks of the *Confraternity of the Scapular*, which is affiliated to the arch-confraternity of the Carmelite Order in Rome. The members of this Confraternity participate in a special manner in the prayers, good works, etc., of the Carmelite Order and obtain the privilegium sabbatinum under

condition that they wear the scapular and perform certain works of devotion. (Cf. Beringer, 10 ed., pag. 630).

Affiliation to this Confraternity requires that application be made with the consent of the Ordinary, to one of the Carmelite generals in Rome (Discalced Carmelites, Via della Panetteria 45, or the monks at S. Maria Traspontina). The formula suggested by P. Pius may indeed serve this purpose.

However, in view of what Beringer says (pag. 491), it would appear that the Bishops, and not the General of the Order has the right of appointing the director *confraternitatis.* Hence, whilst the mediation of P. Pius offers the easiest way of obtaining the diploma, the form proposed by Beringer (pag. 518, 519), would seem preferable.

Accordingly our Bishops have not the right of establishing *this* confraternity, but only of permitting its establishment, approving its statutes and appointing a director, etc.

It is to be noted that there is a distinction between the "Facultas erigendi sodalitatem *Scapularis B. M. V. de monte Carmelo*" and the "Facultas erigendi confraternitatem B. M. V. *de monte Carmelo.*" It is to this latter confraternity to which the faculties of our Bishops are restricted. This is clear from the statement of the S. Cong. Prop. Fide (Cf. ECCL. REVIEW. April, 1896), which denies that the power *benedicendi and imponendi Scapulare* B. M. V. *de monte Carmelo* is included in this faculty. If individual Bishops have secured such a power by special rescript, the terms of the latter will state whether they enjoy besides the right *benedicendi et imponendi*, also the faculty *pro confessario* of commuting the works imposed for the gaining of the Sabbantine Privilege, in cases where it is difficult to fulfil the required works. The same is true of faculties granted to priests through the Bishop *vi potestatis apostolicae*, since the Sovereign Pontiff and the sacred Congregations unquestionably have the power of commuting such works. Hence, we cannot agree with P. Pius in his assertion (ECCLE. REVIEW, p. 558, ad 2), that a priest who obtains his faculties through the Bishop *per modum subdelegationis* forfeits the *facultas commutandi ut supra*, unless he simply means that the *fa-*

cultas imponendi scapulare (et inscribendi fideles in confraternitatem), does not *eo ipso* include the *facultas commutandi*, which would indeed be true.

The Indulgences gained by virtue of association with the *Confraternitas B. M. V. de monte Carmelo*, which our Bishops are empowered to erect according to Faculty C. are simply the Indulgences of the *Confraternity* (enumerated by Beringer, p. 641).

From the fact that the confraternities which our Bishops may erect independently of the Carmelite affiliation do not participate in a special manner in the prayers and good works of the Order, he seems to draw the conclusion that this faculty is altogether void. This is an error. The terms of the faculty expressly state the contrary—"*erigendi* confraternitates." Since "verba valent quantum sonant" our Bishops have evidently the right of canonically erecting confraternities which, though not directly connected with the Carmelite Order are none the less confraternities. Even if the exclusive management of the confraternity of our Lady of Mount Carmel had been entrusted to the Carmelite Order, the Holy See could not be said to be bound by such provisions. As a matter of fact the Holy See vindicates this authority for itself in regard to other confraternities in Rome, which it permits to be erected, not only for missionary districts, but in places where there is a permanently constituted hierarchy. Of late years the general Indults in favor of confraternities were not made to include those attached to the Carmelites, Servites and Trinitarians, nor that of the Rosary; nevertheless the Bishops who depended for their jurisdiction on the Propaganda continued legitimately to erect confraternities, not only of Mt. Carmel, but of the Rosary, without having recourse to the Superiors of the respective Orders. (Cf. the Instructio S. C. de Prop. Fide of June, 1889, in THE AM. ECCL. REV., 1889, page 465, and Pastoralbl. 1895, page 80.)

THE ABBÉ DUCHESNE AND ANGLICAN ORDERS.

The learned Abbé Duchesne's favorable interpretation of the Anglican claims as to the validity of priestly Orders

transmitted through Matthew Parker has received its acknowledgment in the honorary degree of Doctor of Letters, conferred by the University of Cambridge. The Cambridge orator introduced the French priest on this occasion with the following words: "Laetamur inter Anglos adesse hodie virum summa eruditione, summo animi candore praeditum, qui liberalitate vere Christiana, animo vere fraterno, etiam, Ecclesiam Anglicanam respicit, qui Cantabrigiae denique paulisper moratus non obliviscetur unum certe e Collegiis nostris habuisse quondam magistrum Matthaeum Parker, archiepiscopum Cantuariensem, per quem ordines sacros in Ecclesiam Anglicanam serie perpetua defluxisse credimus." We do not know whether the abbé made any remonstrance or felt the irony of the whole compliment; but if his authority will be invoked by Anglicans as a Catholic recognition of Episcopal ordination in the English Church, we would refer them to the clear words of Leo XIII, in the present Encyclical, where the Anglican Bishops from Parker down are told, in all charity, that by their "secession, they are separated from the foundation on which the whole edifice (of the Church) must rest." It matters little whether the stone, intended for the foundation of the edifice, was rejected by the builders, or whether it was separated by some other cause. We know that it is "therefore outside of the edifice itself." "Anglicans exiled from the Kingdom, the keys of which were given by Christ to Peter alone."

ADVANTAGES OF RECITING THE CROSIER BEADS.

Qu. You mentioned in a former issue of the REVIEW how the so-called Crosier Beads may be obtained, and spoke of the "exceptional" Indulgences attached to their blessing.

Would you please to state the exceptional advantages?

Resp. The Indulgences are "quingentorum dierum quoties in rosario oratio dominica vel salutatio angelica dicitur;" that is five hundred days for the recitation of *each* "Our Father" or "Hail Mary."

1. It is not required, therefore, that one recite the entire

rosary before gaining the Indulgences. The prayer may be interrupted without forfeiting the spiritual advantages attached to separate invocations.

2. It is not necessary to meditate on the different mysteries of the three-fold rosary, as is required for gaining the Indulgences of the Dominician or other Beads. The devout recitation of the "Our Father" or "Hail Mary" suffices.

3. The Indulgences can be applied to the souls in Purgatory at the will of him who recites the Beads.

4. The Beads can, by a special additional blessing, receive other Indulgences over and beyond those attached to the Crosier blessing, providing the prayers and other conditions for gaining them are separately performed.

N. B. The Beads cannot be sold, nor given to another after having been designated for a definite purpose, nor loaned to another, that is to say, in these cases the Indulgences would not be gained by the person to whom the Beads are sold, given or loaned.

A LITURGICAL MONTHLY.

Qu. Is there any periodical publication exclusively devoted to the treatment of liturgical questions, such as would be of particular service to teachers of rubrics and liturgy?

Resp. A very good liturgical monthly, which deserves the support of the clergy everywhere, is the *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, published by the Vincentian Fathers (Congregation of the Mission at Rome). It deals mainly with rubrical questions, sacred archeology and liturgy in their scientific and practical aspects. Fasc. of about 100 pages, monthly. Pr. 12 lire. Address *Ephem. Liturgicae*, Via del Missione, 2, Roma, Italia.

Another publication of great use to professors of liturgy is the *Analecta Ecclesiastica*, to which we have already called attention. Its scope is somewhat broader than that of the *Ephemerides*, as it brings the current decrees of the S. Congregations and discusses questions proposed to the Roman Office *in extenso*. The publication office is Via dei Coronari, 181, Roma, Italia. Large quarto, about 45 pages. Pr. 25 lire.

BOOK REVIEW.

THE MISSING LINKS OF THE (ENGLISH RELIGIOUS) ESTABLISHMENT. Plain facts bearing on Orders, Jurisdiction, and the Theory of Continuity. By W. W. Hardwicke, M.D.—R. Washbourne, London, 1894. Pp. 36.

REASONS FOR REJECTING ANGLICAN ORDERS. By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J.—London. Catholic Truth Society. 1895. Pp. 150.

ETUDE THÉOLOGIQUE SUR LES ORDINATIONS ANGLICANES. A. Boudinhon—Paris: P. Lethielleux.

VALIDITÉ DES ORDINATIONS ANGLICANES. L'abbé Gustave Delasge,—Paris: Libraire Religieuse H. Oudin. 1895.

DE LA VALIDITÉ DES ORDINATIONS ANGLICANES. Par l'abbé A. Boudinhon, Prof. à l'Instit. Cathol. de Paris.—Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1896. Pp. 91. Pr. frcs. 1.75.

A FEW PLAIN THOUGHTS upon the Anglican Movement. By Fr. H. Reginald Buckler, O. P.—Woodchester: "Rosary" Press.—London: Burns & Oates. 1896. Pp. 69.

ARE ANGLICAN ORDERS VALID? By J. MacDevitt, D.D.—Dublin. Sealy, Bryers & Walker.—New York: Benziger Bros.—London: Burns & Oates. 1896. Pp. XV. 75. Pr. 1s. 6d.

The numerous monographs published within the last two years on the subject of Anglican Orders agree in the main point, namely that Anglican Orders are thoroughly suspect, and that therefore the the Church cannot accept them as valid. The historical uncertainty as to the validity of Parker's consecration, arising from the well-founded doubt whether Barlow, who performed the function, was ever consecrated himself, is an old standing argument. Of this Dr. Hardwicke gives a most succinct account. The more pronounced and positive proof against the validity of Anglican Orders is how-

ever sought by the modern, especially the English controversialists, in the insufficiency of the form used for the rite of ordination or consecration. It is Catholic doctrine and common sense that the form designates and determines the subject matter in which the sacramental act is to be effected. The form must be substantially true, and it must be materially united with the matter which it designates. A *substantial* corruption of the form, or a lack of at least moral union between the form and the matter, vitiates the act of ordination. Now, according to the majority of interpreters, this corruption is found in the Anglican ritual, and they moreover hold with P. Sydney F Smith (page 145) that it was introduced *intentionally in an heretical sense.* If this be true then the question is settled. But theologians do not wholly agree in their estimates of the facts which would establish the aforesaid contention. Last year P. Boudinhon, editor of the *Canoniste Contemporain* wrote an exhaustive pamphlet on the subject of validity of Anglican orders, in which he brought this same argument. Not long after he published a second brochure in which he modifies his conclusions, saying "j'avais conclu, je l'avoue, trop rapidement à l'insuffisance des formules anglicanes, ayant un peu trop vîte une difference substantielle entre ces prières et celles des formes catoliques." Another French priest, the Abbé Delasge had made a similar admission, going however somewhat farther in his conclusions, for the abbé Boudinhon does not think that the form employed in the English ordinal, whatever may be its possible construction, can be allowed as effecting valid ordination, since it distinctly lacks the authorization of the Church. The proof of this lies in the established and unvarying practice of the Church, ever since the separation, of unconditionally re-ordaining Anglican ministers returning to the Catholic fold. Such a historic fact lodges a strong presumption against the contentions of the Anglican party as maintained in their latest authoritative exposition *De Hierarchia Anglicana* by the Rev. Edward Denny and the Rev. T. A. Lacey. This work was intended to embody the complete answers to Catholic objections. The fact that it was written in Latin made it accessible to the foreign members of the Papal commission who were already favorably disposed toward the acceptance of validity if the proofs were at all adequate and compatible with a safe and reverent treatment of the Sacraments of the Catholic Church. But the results were against the Anglican orders as valid. This is plain from the latest Encyclical, which though it contains no direct pronouncement on the subject, by which the question is cate-

gorically answered, too plainly indicates the mind of the Pontiff upon so momentous an issue.

Anglicans, sincerely in quest of the truth, will henceforth require courage proportionate to these unmistakable lights. Their Bishops may, as Dr. McDevitt paradoxically puts it, "have Apostolical succession but not valid Orders."

NOMENCLATOR LITERARIUS RECENTIORIS THEOLOGIAE CATHOLICAE, theologos exhibens qui inde a Concilio Tridentino floruerunt, aetate, natione, disciplina distinctos. Edidit et commentariis auxit H. HURTUR, S.J., S. Theol. et Philos. Doctor, ejusdem S. Theolog. in C. R. Universitate Oenipontana Professor P. O. EDITIO ALTERA plurimum aucta et emendata. Vol. I-III. 1892–1895. Innsbruck, Austria, Wagner.

An acquaintance with the lives and writings of theologians is all-important to the student of theology. With a library of fair dimensions at hand, research has always been comparatively easy in studying the Fathers and Scholastics. This is true, at least, so far as the greater lights in theology are concerned. But even with the best of resources, one might be unable to acquire a thorough knowledge of the theologians of the last few centuries. Any serious attempt to remove this crying want must needs deserve the gratitude of all interested in the study of sacred science. The Nomenclator is more than an attempt in this direction. The name of Rev. Dr. H. Hurter, S.J., already well known to the theologian by his "Patrum opuscula selecta" and his "Compendium theologiae dogmaticae," is sufficient guarantee that an attempt means success.

The first edition of this work appeared in three volumes, from 1871 to 1886. It embraced the time from the Council of Trent to the beginning of the Vatican Council. Of this edition, the celebrated theologian, Dr. M. E. Scheeben, writes in 1887: "Through P. Hurter's earnest efforts, the sore need of a trustworthy guide through the abundance of modern theological literature has been supplied as successfully as could be expected from a first attempt of this kind." (Lit. Handw. 1887. n. 431.) How well the book was received is shown by the fact that, notwithstanding the small circle for which it was intended, a second edition became necessary only a few years later. The three new volumes appeared in 1892, '93 and '95 respectively. It is by no means a simple reprint of the

first edition, but has been so much improved in every respect as to deserve rather the name of a new work. The history of theology from 1869 to 1894 has been added to this edition.

The first volume comprises the period of 1564–1663 (630 pages); the second, that of 1664–1763 (1846 columns and LIII. pages); the third, that of 1764–1894 (1746 columns and LXII. pages). In epochs of about twenty years, the different branches of theology are considered in the following order: (1) Scholastic theology; (2) polemic and positive theology; (3) sacred Scriptures with the auxiliary disciplines; (4) Patrology; (5) Church history and its various resources; (6) practical theology, including Canon law, Moral theology, Pastoral theology, Liturgy and Mystic theology. From 1800 to 1894, Scholastic theology is omitted, and Apology for the christian religion inserted in its place. In each of these six branches, the authors are arranged, so far as possible, according to the nations among which they flourished—Italy, Spain, France, Belgium, Germany, England and Poland. The other countries are taken in with the ones most closely related to them.

The text is a sketch of the theologian's life, with an enumeration of his works and their various editions, concluding with a short criticism. Notes at the foot of the page frequently refer the reader to resources from which a more thorough knowledge of the authors and their works may be gathered. Neither all the works, however, nor all the editions are treated, but only those which, for some reason or other, deserve a special notice. Thus, whilst nothing of real importance is omitted, unnecessary bulk and tedious enumerations are avoided. In each volume, the text is followed by two tables and two indices. The theological writers are given in tabulated form, from year to year, first according to branches, secondly, according to nations. Difference in type shows whether the author was a theologian of the first, the second, the third or the fourth degree. Of the two indices, in alphabetical order, the one gives the names of the authors, the other refers to the different matters treated of in the book. The name of each author is accompanied by at least two numbers, marking the year of his death and the page or the column containing notice of him. If anyone is mentioned in different places of the book, a third or fourth number is added. Large print of a name shows that the author is of the first or the second degree, the other two being denoted by common type. In the index of contents, the words are followed by the numbers of either the texts (in the first volume only), or the columns

which contain something special on the subject. A very good treatise on a certain matter is marked by numbers in large type.

These brief outlines give an idea of the advantages of the Nomenclator and show that the difficulties in using it are reduced to a minimum. The work was not intended to be a complete history of theology, neither does Dr. Hurter think it free of all imperfections. There is no reason for maintaining the contrary. Considering the nature of the work and the immense difficulties connected with its accomplishment, we must rather admire the author's courage and perseverance, and congratulate him on the great success with which, no doubt, the book, as a whole was crowned.

Instead of going into detail, we wish to endorse a suggestion, made by F. Huelskamp, in the Lit. Handw. 1895. n. 624, that the learned writer should favor us with a supplement about every two or three years. This would keep the student in touch with the best and latest of our own times, supposing that the writings of living authors be not excluded. Often it may even be of greater interest and importance to know something of these than of those of the past.

Rev. Dr. Hurter would certainly oblige all his friends if, in the third edition, he would insert an index of the geographical places mentioned in the work, adding the modern names used in the respective countries. Besides increasing the value of the Nomenclator, this could be used as reference in the perusal of other books.

We wish and hope that the Nomenclator may meet with many friends, especially in the United States, where at present it seems to be but little known.

P. JOSEPH SITTENAUER, O.S.B.

St. Benedict's Abbey, Atchison, Kansas.

THE MISSAL OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S ABBEY, CANTERBURY. With excerpts from the Antiphonary and Lectionary of the same Monastery. Edited with an Introductory Monograph, from a MS. in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. By Martin Rule, M. A.—London: C. J. Clay & Sons, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane. Glasgow: Argyle Str. Royal 8vo. Pp. CLXXXIV., 174 Pr. 30 sh.

The church of Canterbury is not only the oldest of the Anglo-Saxon Sees, but it exercised for centuries the primacy over all the

churches in England and even of Ireland before any metropolitan bishoprics had been established there. For a century and a half the archbishops of Canterbury were sent from Rome to fill the patriarchal See of England. St. Augustine, first archbishop, brought with him, as must be supposed, the Missal in use at Rome at the time, that is to say, at the end of the sixth century. A missal of this description is preserved in St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, (MS. cccc., 270). Examination of this missal has shown that the oldest and most important part of it is taken from the Sacramentary of St. Gregory. Mr. Rule, who was induced to interest himself in the further examination of this venerable relic, claims to have ascertained "in terms of letters and in terms of lines, the textual content of a page of the Roman prototype," and likewise the contents of a page of the *exemplar* used by the scribe of the above MS. missal, from which examination he comes to the conclusion that a page of the exemplar was the textual equivalent of a page of the prototype. Furthermore, Mr. Rule undertakes to demonstrate that the Roman prototype and the Canterbury exemplar are identical. Nay, he finds from a careful study of stichometry that the exemplar was the very volume which Gregory had used as his own working copy of his "sacramentary."

Now all this is very important not only for the student of liturgical science, but in the practical matter of Apologetics. If the missal of Canterbury gives us, as Mr. Rule demonstrates quite satisfactorily, a careful recension of the verbal text of the Roman Sacramentary, then it becomes a powerful argument against Anglican liturgical innovations and all that such innovations imply from the historico-dogmatical point of view. Rome has been the type from the beginning. Rome must remain the type to the end, and the most unimpeachable of English primates, St. Augustine himself, bids the tenants of his archiepiscopal hold return to Roman faith and Roman practice and to have their title of legitimacy signed in Roman terms.

We hope to bring in an early issue a more detailed account of this valuable discovery by Mr. Rule which is no less interesting than important in view of the present question regarding the return of Anglican Christians to the unity of the Roman Church from whom St. Augustine obtained his evangelical passport and to whose worship he taught Anglo-Saxons to conform.

ALETHEA: AT THE PARTING OF THE WAYS. By Cyril. Two volumes. London: Burns & Oats. (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros.)

This work, unlike two well-known books in English bearing the same name, (one by Dr. Pise the other by Bishop Ricards), does not deal with the doctrinal exposition of Catholic truth, but is rather a historical novel. The reader is placed in the Christian city of Constantinople during the latter half of the ninth century, at the time when the venerable Ignatius was forced from the Patriarchal See by the intrigues of Bardas in order to promote the ambition of Photius and give the Emporer unrestrained liberty of conduct. Thence arose the great schism which separated the churches of the East and West—a fact indicated by the sub-title of the book—"The Parting of the Ways."

"Alethea" is a relative of the Empress Theodore and a ward of Photius. Unlike her ambitious guardian she shows herself possessed of wonderful grace and nobility of character, and is made, incidentally, to set forth the motives of the leadlng actors in the play, who are drawn from the actual history of the times. The romance which serves as the thread of this exposition unites her to a noble soldier who had defended the Bishop Ignatius from the insolence of the Bardas Cæsar in the cathedral of St. Sophia one morning, which act first attracted the admiration of the girl who was present at the scene.

The descriptions are beautiful, and, as far as can be, true to fact; this applies likewise to the delineations of character. Altogether the book fits in well with Wiseman's "Fabiola," as supplying an illustrative tale of the Church in the East at this period, for the "Popular Catholic Library."

Apart from this there appears to us a special significance in the subject matter chosen by "Cyril." It is a singularly apt picture of the elements which foster disunion among Christians, and of the disastrous consequence which normally accompany the assertion of State rule above the Church. There are many lessons in the pages of these two handsome volumes, which may be profitably conned over by men and women of our day. The society of Greece in those days seems hardly to have differed from our own; at least the types are alike, and the speech of Nicholas I. to the rulers and people of his day might have come with equal aptness from the lips of Leo XIII. addressing our own generation. Moreover, the

reader is made familiar with many of the peculiar rites and forms of the Eastern liturgy, which is of practical value to Catholics, in view of the desired union of the Churches.

It is another solid book added to the best class of entertaining Catholic literature, much superior to the bulk of what is sold as such.

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE AT THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES. By Johannes Janssen. Translated from the German by M. A. Mitchell and A. M. Christie. In two volumes. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. Pp. 355 and 303.

These two volumes form the introductory portion of Janssen's History of Germany, which, beginning with the end of the Middle Ages, that is about 1450, reaches in its eighth volume down to the beginning of the sixteenth century. The ground covered by the German historian would thus, when completed in English translation, fill sixteen volumes.

The matter before us constitutes, however, a complete whole, inasmuch as it sketches the conditions of German society in its literary, artistic, social, economic and political aspects, at the time when the fever germs of the so-called Reformation were breaking forth. It is a wonderful story of high aims and low ambitions, of sober thrift and sottish idleness, of consummate wisdom in great leaders foiled by the political folly of weak princes. The statesman and philosopher, the teacher, reformer and missionary alike will find here abundance of new material among hitherto ill-known or long-forgotten monuments of history, which may serve for the construction of strong passageways for truth in our day. Janssen has demonstrated that history has hardly yet been written unless we accept as such the historical novels or romances or plays in which the *dramatis personae* are made to suit the local notions of the playwright or the capacities of the stage, or the taste of the progressive audience.

But we have on former occasions spoken of the merits of this admirable work which gives us a fair and deeply-interesting insight into the conditions not only of Germany but of Europe in general during a most critical period of its history. When the present volume first appeared in the original, twenty years ago, the desire for a translation was at once expressed on all sides. We believe that several persons both in England and America undertook the task, but soon found themselves compelled to desist in view of the

great difficulty which a satisfactory translation in this case implies. In the first place, there is the language itself which is not simply the modern high German which the author writes, but the various dialects and obsolete words employed in the documents quoted with a view to illustrate the temper of the times. This kind of literature forms a large part of the work, for it is Janssen's particular merit as an historian that he allows the contemporaries of every shade of opinion to speak for their age, and thus leads the reader to form his own estimate of the facts.

The translators, in rendering such parts, have shown good judgment and fair knowledge of their subject matter, and even managed to retain something of the quaint style of the old German idiom by an occasional choice of old English words and grammatical forms of speech. Occasionally they omit portions and give us the sense in much shortened phrase. This method will on the whole recommend itself to the English reader, although in some cases we could wish that they had been more sparing in their clipping. The same may be said of the foot-notes, many of which embodying valuable references for the student, have been omitted. At times the translation utterly fails in expressing the German idiom. We take at random a passage from the third chapter (Vol. II) on "Commerce and Capital." Speaking of the life in the Hansa-community at Bergen the translation reads: "Their *dwellings* consisted of twenty-one independent *courts* which farmed two *vestries*; these courts were separated from each other by solid framework or walls and each one was surrounded by long, straggling wooden buildings," (p. 44). This gives us hardly a right view of the Hansa consisting of (between two and three thousand men) twenty-one distinct *settlements* formed into two *parishes*. The word "Hof" has, it is true, the meaning of "court," as "Kirchspiel" may mean 'vestry'; but the genius of the language admits of a wider and in this case more correct interpretation. Again '*ein debitum legale*" is hardly "an imperative duty," so much as a duty imposed by law, that is to say a duty which *ought* to be performed, but *not of necessity*.

In other respects the work of translation is well and conscientiously done, whilst the form of publication makes it even more readable than the original. We have no doubt it will have a large circulation. There appears to be no reason why the Index at the end of the volume should have been omitted. It is a most valuable part of any book of this kind, and is commonly needed for reference to names and facts.